THE GREAT UNMARRIED

WALTER M. GALLICHAN

HQ 800 G168g 1915

02710020R

NLM 05018110 4

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

ARMY MEDICAL LIBRARY

WASHINGTON

Founded 1836

LIBRARY OF THE SURGEON GENERAL'S OFFICE

WAR DEPARTMENT

Section

Number 379608

o r o 3—10543

Form 113c, W. D., S. G. O.
(Revised June 13, 1936)

DUE TWO WEEKS FROM LAST DATE

L MAR 1 8 1955

THE GREAT UNMARRIED

THE GREAT UNMARRIED

BY

WALTER M. GALLICHAN

AUTHOR OF
"MODERN WOMAN AND HOW TO MANAGE HER";
"WOMEN UNDER POLYGAMY," ETC.

NEW YORK
FREDERICK A. STOKES COMPANY
PUBLISHERS

Annex
11a
800
G165
1915

CONTENTS

PART I

THE PROBLEM STATED

CHAP.		PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTION	9
II.	NATURE'S CELIBATES	15
III.	CELIBACY IN PRIMITIVE PEOPLES	21
IV.	CELIBACY IN HISTORY	24
V.	CELIBACY AND MODERN INDUSTRIALISM	29
VI.	THE EXTENT OF CELIBACY	46
VII.	THE GREAT UNMARRIED AND SOCIETY	53
VIII.	TYPES OF MODERN CELIBATES	66
IX.	CELIBACY AS A VOLUNTARY IDEAL	74
X.	CELIBACY AS A PENALTY	92
XI.	CELIBACY AND THE LAW	97
XII.	ADOLESCENT RESTRAINT AND PRE-MARITAL CELIBACY	107
XIII.	THE RESULTS OF CELIBACY	116

CONTENTS

PART II

THE REMEDIES

CHAP.		PAGE
XIV.	WHAT ARE THE REMEDIES?	133
XV.	THE ECONOMIC REMEDY	140
XVI.	THE SOCIAL REMEDY	153
XVII.	THE LEGAL REMEDY	173
XVIII.	THE SWAY OF MARRIAGE	185
XIX.	THE REMEDY FOR PSEUDO-CELIBACY	191
XX.	THE UPLIFTING OF MARRIAGE	208

PART I

THE PROBLEM STATED

THE GREAT UNMARRIED

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The natural destiny of man and woman is marriage.

Viewed from the standpoints of racial well-being, national prosperity, hygiene, and morality, marriage is a biological and social duty. In Great Britain the state of wedlock is esteemed as an ideal. The union is made holy by ecclesiastic sanction, protected and regulated by the law, and commended by economists, moralists, and reformers. It is cherished, extolled, and advocated by poets and preachers. Yet strangely, any hint of suggested reforms for the facilitation and encouragement of matrimony imbues a number of the apparent advocates of the essential institution with alarm or indignation.

We counsel marriage strenuously with one breath, and impose hindrances to practice with the next. Lamenting the falling birth-rate, the decline of marriages, the involuntary celibacy of a vast number of women, the pseudo-celibacy of men, which gives rise to a grave social and moral problem, and recognising the evils that grow from an abnormal condition of society, when the strongest yearnings are not naturally and rationally appeased, we are still apt to scent peril in all measures that would foster earlier and more numerous marriages.

Our veneration for "the home" is, upon examination, a mere sentimental profession, entirely stultified by the fact that the possession of a home is made increasingly difficult for an enormous mass of the inhabitants of the United Kingdom. To very many, a home of their own is but a far-off, scarcely possible

consummation of a profound longing—a dream of a species of personal Utopia.

Rents and the cost of living in accordance with imperative standards of respectability, or status, rise steadily with only a slight increase of wages. Higher pay often spells costlier living. In many parts of the country a working couple, who wish to marry, are forced to defer marriage indefinitely for the simple reason that there is no dwelling-place available. Everyone acquainted with the life of small towns and the country-side can testify concerning this source of discouragement to wedlock.

The lack of homes is but one of the manifold causes of enforced celibacy, the postponement of marriage to middle-age, and the fall in the birth-rate. There are numerous impeding and inhibiting factors, which must be set down in this inquiry. A community that cannot devise means for a normal, moral sex-life for its members is in an unwholesome and dangerous condition. Involuntary celibacy can become a serious canker. Yet we place a premium on the single state, and stimulate directly most of the evils that our moralists deplore. The compulsory celibate is cheated of a supreme human right. This injustice is visited by Nature with unflinching severity, and the individual and the community are rigorously punished.

Industrialism clamorously demands plentiful toilers. Industrialism sets up at the same time tremendous obstacles to the reproduction of workers. The State requires vigorous men for the army and navy. The State, with its mediaeval or archaic prejudices, discourages the conjugality that would result in the procreation of soldiers and sailors. Legislators ignore, shelve, or suppress proposals that would render marriage attainable and raise the birth-rate. The Church symbolises, sanctifies, and honours the married state in theory; in practice, the sacerdotalist renders marriage an unequal contract. Reform of the marriage law, one of the chief aids to the encouragement of marriage, the conservation of sex-morality, and the welfare of the people is sternly and persistently opposed by the bulk of clerical absolutists, led principally by voluntary celibate bishops and clergy.

INTRODUCTION

I contend that the way of the man or woman, in all except the privileged classes, who desires to love in accordance with natural decree, and the highest social morality, is rendered harder year by year. The discouragement of licit sex-unions by economic, legislative, and ecclesiastic hindrances is one of the flagrant sources of irregularity in sexual life, the promiscuity and polygyny of our civilisation, many of the mental and physical ailments and disabilities of masses of the population, and incalculable direct and indirect evils.

Among the thoughtful in all orders of society there is a deepening discontent, through the frustration arising from the inequalities that tend to postpone the age of marriage or to condemn to lifelong celibacy. The unrest of the wage-earning classes is due in part to this anomaly. The revolt of an ever-accumulating number of intelligent women is partly the outcome of a thwarting of emotional and passionate desire for mating and maternity. All gynæcologists and alienists of authority assert that enforced protracted celibacy among women is often, if not always, injurious to the individual and therefore menacing to the race. Every student of sexual psychology realises that the side-tracking of the imperious sex-impulse, under sexual segregation and celibacy, produces manifest psychic and moral aberrations and abnormalities. The denial of maternity to a host of women is calamitous.

The social, legal, and canonical impediments to conjugal life foster celibacy in men, or lead to a deferment of marriage. Whatever may be said in part assent to the generalisation that prostitution is "as inseparable from marriage as the shadow from the substance," the truth remains that early wedlock for men is a check upon the commercialised intercourse of the sexes, and a safeguard to the health of the population. On moral grounds supremely, matrimony should be facilitated by all possible means. From the hygienic basis, it is essential that the greatest number of nubile men and women shall unite. Economically considered, a well-balanced marriage rate is a sign of prosperity and power in the nation.

The conservation and employment of virility is a prime duty of the State. An infecund population is

degenerate. The call for citizens must, however, be a demand for quality rather than mere numbers. The increase of the feeble-minded is one of the perils of to-day.

The problem of celibacy in civilised societies grows ever more acute and intricate. Insidiously, social conditions work for a species of sterilisation of those fitted for parentage by the rearing of alarming barriers to conjugation. The natural impulses, repressed, checked, and unsublimated, become morbid, and tend to atrophy, to hyperæsthesia, or to anæsthesia. Abnormalities and vices flourish in this unwholesome soil. Besides these grosser manifestations, there are manifold complex, morbid, psychic phenomena, unrecognised by the inexperienced and the average lay mind.

The celibate is inharmonious, out of gear with the social mechanism, and in some respects his celibacy is a menace to the common good. As a positive, genuine celibate, he may still exercise, though unconsciously, an unfavourable influence upon his social environment. Living as he does, remote from a great field of human experience, emotion, joy, discipline, and stress, he is not efficiently equipped with the insight, knowledge of human nature, and sympathy that make good citizenship. In a position of authority, he is likely to commit disastrous errors. As a preacher or leader of men, his teaching or leading will be tinctured by his imperfect apprehension of life. This is no impeachment of chastity, which is often misunderstood as implying the celibate state. Chastity is both moral and sanative. It may or may not co-exist with celibacy, just as it may or may not co-exist with marriage. The chaste heart and chaste conduct are found in both conditions.

The pseudo-celibates, who are repeatedly enumerated as the highest proportion among bachelors, are undoubtedly accountable for much injustice and suffering. Seduction, infanticide, abortion, prostitution, and other ills and sorrows often rise in spectre form in the consciences of those who are not hopelessly abandoned and inhumanly callous. The "gay bachelor" is too often a wholly irresponsible, anti-social member of society, whose so-called gaieties spell degradation and grief to others.

INTRODUCTION

The apparent unpopularity of marriage is a sinister omen. It is perhaps incorrect to say that conjugality is in widespread disfavour. It is true that the menace of grievous and burdensome marriage laws, the grinding economic pressure, the difficulty in supporting and educating a family, and the absurd estimate of the necessary adjuncts and style of living in marriage are among the more palpable causes of a fear of entering into wedlock. These menaces and hindrances must be considered with due attention in our effort to discover amelioration.

It is certain that the anomaly of a multitude of men and women in a wealthy nation, who, desiring marriage, and heeding eagerly the national creed that bids them unite for the good of themselves and the State, and are yet unable to fulfil their natural desires and functions, is one of the salient disorders of our boastful civilisation. Provision for the maintenance of the people in comfort, and the facilitation of marriage at the age of reproductive vigour, are the two paramount duties of a cultivated community.

The great European war has taught us some needed lessons. Maybe reconstruction and reform will bring changes of a momentous character when the mass of the population awaken to the fact that our future destiny as a race is at stake. The devastation of warfare is vast; but the less dramatic, yet enormous, devastation wrought by a social system that cheats a host of men and women of the common right and the normal need of gratifying the primary, massive, and beneficent impulses is always with us.

In Greece and Rome, and notably in Sparta, celibacy was regarded almost as a misdemeanour. These States recognised plainly the personal and collective evils accruing from an abnormal mode of living. The growth of hysterical, neurasthenic and psychopathic disorders of an amatory origin, especially among women, is in itself sufficient proof that imposed celibacy is a constant peril to the health and mental sanity of the community. Primitive people and races in the East are almost free from these disorders. In the West the right to love is withheld from a mass of men and a still larger number of women. The moral and sanitary

dangers of this denial, during the period of the highest sexual vigour, beset us on every hand.

We must not, however, condemn and misjudge the voluntary celibate in the fashion of some physiological extremists. There is ample ethical justification for celibacy as a self-imposed and purposive denial, and some few are born to this state. We have to determine what is best for the greatest number, and there can be but one answer to an inquiry concerning the relative good of marriage and celibacy in the community.

We have abundant negative counsels of chastity and purity. A more positive teaching is necessary. In 1910, seventy men and women of the highest culture met at Florence to discuss the sexual problem. Among the members of the conference were Catholic and Protestant clergymen, Jewish men of science, doctors, economists, and women holding diverse intellectual opinions. The value of pre-conjugal masculine chastity was announced by men of various creeds and philosophies, and the whole question was discussed from a scientific standpoint.[1] It is only upon such a basis that a practicable and truly humane and sound ethic can be established. The congress voiced the opinion of the cultured and earnest minds of Italy, represented by priests as well as by men of science, that "celibacy ought never to be compulsory; yet they recognised that, considered in itself, individual sexual purity, as a means to a life of high apostolic aim, was not to be despised."

The advocacy of marriage at the age of the highest vigour, as a means of race preservation, sexual morality, and hygiene, does not import an ill-judged disapprobation of individual celibate living, voluntarily adopted from conscientious conviction. We are about to consider a social and personal dilemma arising from several causes. Reflection upon this problem is forced upon all of us at the present time, when its complexity is deepened by the deplorable ravages of war among the most vigorous of the male population.

[1] See report of the conference in the appendix to "Sexual Ethics" by Professor Robert Michels of Basle University.

CHAPTER II

NATURE'S CELIBATES

MARTIN LUTHER maintained that the man who is incapable of experiencing the passion of love is manifestly incomplete as a human being. Milton insisted that the loveless life is unendurable. Fanatical reverence for the celibate state has been inculcated in both civilised and semi-barbarous societies. "The senseless practice of celibacy," writes Darwin, "has been ranked from a remote period as a virtue." In ancient and modern times, in most countries, men and women have voluntarily renounced love and marriage as a religious ideal. This renunciation has its plentiful instances, from the New Hebrides and the Skoptzky of Russia, to the celibate clergy of cultured nations.

A lengthy examination of the ethical, social, and other aspects of voluntary abstention from marriage, on pleas of sanctity and virtue, scarcely comes within the scope of this book. The commonly enunciated view of asceticism that it is "unnatural," or, as William Morris expressed it, "a disgusting vice," is superficial and often extravagant. An ascetic of the type of St Benedict, a man of normal desires, is not a revolting spectacle to a tolerant and understanding mind. Such renunciation and struggle represent "therapeutic measures for moral purification," and the effort is worthy of respect, in regard to the pureness of motive, even when the practice is open to criticism on several issues.

There is a romantic and adventurous side to pious asceticism, as Havelock Ellis wisely indicates. So long as the Church surrounded chastity, virginity and

ascetic practice with romance, men and women were to be found who discovered supreme joy in overcoming natural impulses. In the struggle they experienced euphoria. Later ecclesiastic authority, by imposing celibacy on the priesthood, and the infliction of severe penances upon the indulgences of the laity, shattered the romanticism of perpetual chastity. From the ninth century onwards flagrant licence crept into sacred places, and the reaction was inevitable. Pascal shrewdly reviewed the matter in his saying: "*Qui veut faire l'ange fait la bête.*"

The Renaissance and the Protestant Reformation both contested the mandates of compulsory chastity. Chastity was now made possible as a real virtue and a discipline; whereas before it had been, in many instances, a simple avoidance of penalties and pains provided by stern codes. The ministry of the sexual passion to higher things than mere physical gratification was now made possible by sheer, voluntary, self-imposed control. The ascetic leaven is sanative in man's life, but asceticism must not be allowed to degenerate into morbidity in thought and perversion of social judgment.

The natural congenital celibate must be differentiated from the voluntary celibate, inasmuch as he is out of the norm. He or she may be virtuous, exemplary and useful, or otherwise. Such types merit no commendation for a restraint which they have no need to cultivate. Congenital sex-anæsthesia is not a virtue, neither is it a vice. It may arise from physical or psychic sources, or from both. Nature has marked the cold man or the woman as undesirable for the reproduction of the species. As working units of the community, natural celibates may be exceedingly valuable.

The proportion of physiological, or psychic, congenital celibates is not high among men. Among women the number is usually estimated as much higher. The celibate by nature may be potentially sterile or potentially fertile. Anæsthesia does not preclude the production of offspring; whereas hyperæsthesia is sometimes associated with impaired fecundity.

In the animal kingdom, sexual selection is voluntary,

deliberate, and attended with stress, skill, and endurance. The wooing of the higher mammals and of birds is, in frequent instances, an idyllic courtship, transcending in tenderness and emotion the love-foreplay of some primitive peoples. Among these animals the important business of love-making and mating is conducted in a manner that may be described as purely natural, or biologic. With man a multitude of extraneous factors enter into choice and courtship, and artificially complicate a process which is already naturally complex. The existence of property-owning among human beings brings into wooing a perfect network of considerations and issues. This regard to material questions bulks frequently larger than what may be termed natural affinities. The true amative idiosyncrasy of the man and the woman may be, and indeed often is, completely veiled during an average intimate courtship. This is the source of countless errors in choice, and the consequent linking of the maladapted.

The natural celibate sometimes aspires to marry. Marriage is by no means universally entered through love alone. The coldest woman may experience a strong impulse to marry. Frequently she selects a fervent partner. Such catastrophes are common, and they account for the acutest forms of married incompatibility.

The place and function of Nature's celibates in society will be gradually determined. Bees settle the problem by giving specific duties to their neuters. The men and women who recognise that celibacy is their foreordained and natural rôle may find not only compensation, but grateful satisfaction, in the reflection that they are fitted for specialised work in the world. It is essential that they should realise their innate limitation in one highly important respect, while they direct their energy into social activities. Colour-blindness or short-sightedness are considered disqualifications for certain employments. It is a curious social fact that a complete atrophy of sex-passion, or its congenital absence, is not deemed a disability in the case of a reformer, jurist, legislator, preacher, or teacher. The natural celibate is, on the contrary, often found in positions of momentous authority; his or her vitality, untaxed by

seething emotions and nervous strains, finds a gratifying escape-valve in directing the lives and the conduct of normal persons.

Frigidity or anæsthesia may be hereditary and innate, or a pathological condition. According to several investigators, the phenomenon is more frequent among women than is usually supposed, and some have fixed the proportion of "frigides" at ten per cent. Dr Harry Campbell remarks that "the sexual instinct in the civilised woman is, I believe, tending to atrophy." Mantegazza asserts that the erotic impulse is stronger in women than in men, but that women are more liable to sexual coldness.

Feminine aversion to marriage, resulting from defective development, or from a psychic recoil, seems to increase in this country. In the ranks of the advanced feminists there are apostles of anti-marriage, whose views in the Press and on the platform often tend to extravagance. There are, however, many highly intelligent women, who voluntarily relinquish all thought of a married career for the sake of a career in public life, in art, or in religious devotion. Such resolution is not necessarily a proof of an absence of desire for love and parenthood. Generally, the true congenital anæsthetic types instinctively, and often strongly, repel any suggestion of love and marriage. They recognise that Nature has not shaped them for this purpose, and that they form an order apart.

It is said that our civilisation favours the production of a neuter class of women. Some writers on the subject have predicted an increase of these types, and foreshadowed a human society resembling the bee community. The place of the neuter in society may be useful and honourable, even though the reproductive office is unexercised, or the capacity non-existent. Our chief difficulty at the outset of the problem is to distinguish plainly between the pseudo and actual manifestations of anæsthesia. The majority of women, through ignorance, inexperience, and conventional suppression of inquiry into vital questions, are fatally apt to deceive themselves concerning fundamental desires.

Profession of coldness, or of hostility to marriage is not an unerring sign of natural repugnance. Society

has penalised candour in women concerning their most important needs, and the resulting dissimulation is inevitable. The task of defining spurious and true indifference or repugnance towards marriage is therefore extremely complicated, and there will be no clear understanding of the matter until both men and women are more widely educated in questions that we conspire to burke, or to neglect as unessential to sane and moral living.

There is some weight of proof that modern industrial life tends to stimulate the evolution of a neuter type. It is well known that no woman is entirely feminine, and no man wholly masculine. Physiology demonstrates sex-analogies of a physical kind, and psychology reveals a mingling of the masculine and the feminine in the soul of both sexes. Occupation has a marked effect upon the organism and the mind. Men habitually employed in sedentary life tend to lose some of the masculine secondary characters, or to exhibit modification of these qualities. Women who work at the pit-brow, the forge, and in the fields assume certain of the male guises.

A coarsening of tissues is undoubtedly a result of woman's work in laborious industrial fields, just as a tendency to flaccidity of muscle, lessened respiratory power, and increased nervous affectability are to be noted among men who follow the lighter indoor employments. This exchange of labour between the sexes fosters a feminisation of men and a masculinisation of women. The sturdy woman blacksmith is physically a better man than the round-shouldered, weak-kneed, anæmic clerk, though her gain in muscle may spell a loss of some of the softer and more æsthetic female characteristics. In the course of generations, environment may so influence the whole organisation of women workers that the female secondary traits may almost disappear.

Incessant fatigue, and especially exertion at high pressure, is more injurious to women than to men. Women are capable, industrious workers at low pressure, but the testimony of large employers shows that women do not bear the strain of rapid production, whether of the brain or the muscles, so readily as men.

The nerve exhaustion of women in many professions and trades no doubt accounts for the anæmia and other ills that not only affect the body, but react strongly upon the mind and the emotions.

The disinclination for marriage is often a sign of a woman's physical breakdown, and such collapse continually threatens all but the most vigorous in industrial life. Is it not admissible that the overstrain of women's industrialism may favour a development of those neuter qualities that inhibit or discourage normal inclination to marriage and maternity?

The hygienic care of womanhood, as the most important asset of the State, and of industrialism, scarcely enters into the consideration of legislators and employers. Burslem, with its infant death-rate of two hundred-and-five per thousand, affords but one of a host of witnesses that those who loudly deplore a falling birth-rate are not in the least degree concerned to preserve the existing mothers, and to protect and rear the babies that are born. Industrialism demands toilers, but the leaders of industry are supine to such wastage and evidence of grinding conditions, as is instanced in the fact that abnormal births and miscarriages are three times as frequent among women employed in factories as among women otherwise occupied.

Industry calls for vigorous workers. Do employers take heed that the offspring of the workers shall be well-born and sturdy? The children of women wage-earners, who cannot afford to take necessary rest during pregnancy, are below the average weight and less robust than the children of women who have opportunity for rest. In Islington, among the labouring population, 17 per cent of infantile deaths are due to premature birth, a ratio proving that the mothers of this district are feeble and unfitted for maternity.[1]

It is grotesque to cry out for more children while we place menacing barriers to marriage, kill potential and actual mothers, and strangle infants within a few days or months of their birth.

[1] For other facts bearing on the wastage of parentage and the neglect of the mothers of our community, see "Sex in Relation to Society," Havelock Ellis.

CHAPTER III

CELIBACY IN PRIMITIVE PEOPLES

CHASTITY, or sexual purity and morality, is not exclusively a Christian or civilised virtue. Restraint, continence, and asceticism are practised by savages as discipline, control, and the conservation of health and hardihood. The Indians of British Columbia, the natives of the Gold Coast, and the people of Tahiti, to mention only a few primitive races, inculcate and practise chastity. Before the influence of foreign immigrants, the Tahitians were famed for exceptional continence.

Chastity among semi-civilised and uncultured tribes is a natural result of the periodic manifestation of the sex-impulse, as differentiated from its ever-present insistence among the higher civilisations. The inter-seasonal period is one of complete abstinence arising from the slumber of desire. On the other hand, there are instances among savage people of strict pre-marital abstinence, and of severe observance of periodic chastity, even when the obsession is strongest.

The warrior is initiated into warfare by the strenuous self-control of his passions and cravings. Girls are guarded from antenuptial irregularity, because a breach of chastity lowers their value as wives. It is doubtful whether unrestrained licence, or chaotic promiscuity, prevail among those primitive folk who have escaped the corruption and example of civilised people. The Esquimaux do not permit celibacy, but their apparent promiscuity is in reality a communal system of marriage, with its code and regulations. Among the Apaches chastity is imperative upon women before marriage and after.

THE GREAT UNMARRIED

The practice of chastity in primitive societies does not imply that a large number of the people are celibate. Life-long celibacy is almost unknown among the uncivilised and half-civilised races. In most primitive communities there is a horror of celibacy; in some it is sinful, and in the majority there is provision for the marriage of the young men and maidens, the widowers and the widows. Celibacy may be voluntarily adopted by the wizard, the priest, or the fakir who wishes to impress his neighbours with his zeal in ascetic living; but the state is shunned and abhorred by the mass of the people at the nubile age.

The preparatory restraint of puberty and the periodic observance of continence are, in the case of savage males, instances of discipline or hygiene, and may or may not possess a religious significance, or an association with tabu. There is, however, no reverence for celibacy as an ideal state of life; but, on the contrary, celibacy is regarded as a disgrace, or a neglect of tribal or communal obligation.

The licentiousness of savages, which has been very assiduously overstated, is not the reason of the practical non-existence of primitive celibacy. Australian aborigines have austere rules forbidding promiscuous sex-relations. The Malays are strictly chaste in time of war. In Africa, though we may find that generally little or no value is attached to the chastity of girls before marriage, there are some tribes that harshly penalise the unchastity of women. Cambodia and Northern India have communities of uncultured people who observe the strictest chastity.

The conditions of savage life largely inhibit the development of strong sexuality. There is extreme probability that civilisation has increased the reproductive vigour of both sexes, while there is little doubt that it has heightened the erotic impulse. When we reflect that primitive men, with their feebler amativeness, are nevertheless fearful of the social results of celibacy, and that civilised Western nations, with their tendency to hyperæsthesia, place a premium upon it, we are fain to inquire whether culture is a gain or a loss, when viewed in the light of this curious phenomenon.

CELIBACY

The sex-morality of most savage societies contrasts remarkably with the loose amatory morals of civilised countries. The sexual instinct is usually normal and unperverted among primitive people, because sanctioned marriage, in one or another of its forms, is attainable at the period of the highest reproductive power. Compulsory celibacy engenders a number of social evils in the older civilised States.

Passing from the lower races to the old civilisations of the East, we find that celibacy is universally avoided as one of the chief ills of life. In Burma the unmarried man or woman is considered incomplete and anti-social. Marriage is early, and facility of divorce heightens the marriage rate here as elsewhere. Celibacy is almost unknown in Japan, and is rare in China. In India only widows are condemned to the single life. Vishnu places reproach upon virginity. Hindu scriptures enjoin chastity and restraint, but there is no commendation of a celibate life.

The creed of Islam discountenances prolonged celibacy in the injunction: "Marriage is incumbent on all who possess the ability. There is no monasticism in Islam."

The excesses and prostitution of savage people are very frequently the effects of civilised example. It is the rule of most civilised States to forbid the practice of prostitution among white women in the colonies. Thus the inferior or subject race is contaminated by the dominant race, and there are instances of whole tribes of robust primitive people becoming diseased and morally and physically degenerate through contact with civilisation.

Almost everywhere among the barbarous, and often among the partially cultured peoples, continence is the rule, and periodic abstention is sometimes practised. There is, however, scarcely any compulsory protracted celibacy after the marriageable age. Very often a severe stigma is attached to the unmated. Celibacy, like the worst forms of licence, is a phenomenon of an advanced stage of national development.

CHAPTER IV

CELIBACY IN HISTORY

At various periods of human history, and in various nations, enforced celibacy has ruled among groups of the community. In ancient and modern times, perpetual abstinence has been, and is still, compulsory among the sacerdotal order, the devotees of religions, and the ascetic communities. Whole sects, such as the Essenes and Valesians, have professed absolute continence, and there are well-known instances of self-mutilation for the preservation of inviolate chastity.

Voluntary personal celibacy has numberless instances in the chronicles of mystics and seers. Strict and often prolonged continence has been part of the training of warriors and athletes of many races. The social imposition of celibacy upon a mass of the people is illustrated by slavery in old-time and present-day forms. Dominant races and classes have always "exploited" weaker races and classes. This oppression, national and internecine, has prevailed from the earliest history of mankind. The culture of the ancient civilisations of the East, the grandeur and glory of Greece and Rome, and the prosperity and refinement of Western nations were products of more or less barbarous systems of slavery, serfdom, and vassalage. The ancient martial races, by the segregation of male slaves, sometimes doomed masses of their fellowmen to celibate life. As soldier or labourer, the slave was denied a fundamental human right, while the female captives were impounded for menial service, or used as ministers to the pleasures of the conquering or exploiting host.

Under the Roman Republic the slaves, who numbered millions, were regarded as the equals of mules and

beasts of burden. Cicero defined the human drudges as *servi*. The plebeians, the poorer classes, were ousted from employment by the flood of imported slaves. According to Michelet, "the rich only secured his riches by acquiring more and overwhelming the poor." Cæcilius Isidorus is said to have bequeathed four thousand one hundred and sixteen slaves to his heir.

The Greeks, in the days of Homer, treated all prisoners of war as slaves. Alexander, at the burning of Thebes, sold the whole population of the city for slaves. In ancient Chaldea, Egypt, and Arabia the custom of helotry flourished for centuries.

The barter and compulsory servitude of men and women were protected in England by the law of Alfred the Great. In Saxon and Norman times, the peasants were sold like cattle in the market-places, and children were exported as slaves. At a much later date in English history Sir John Hawkins traded in African negroes, and sold them to the West Indies. In 1786, England carried off forty-two thousand slaves.

This by no means discredited system of compulsory labour, which has flourished in all ages, virtually placed the slave in the position of a beast or a chattel. The slave-owner could enforce celibacy or compel marriage at his will. Helpless poverty, always a factor of celibacy, denied in those days, as in our own, the right of mating. Under the Feudal System a serf could marry, but only with the consent of his master; and the owner had the right to sunder a couple at any time by selling the man or the woman.

Captives of war among the polygamous nations were treated as slaves. Frequently the males were emasculated to serve as eunuchs in the harems, while the females were imprisoned in the seraglios, and deprived of liberty of choice in sexual union. Modern society affords an analogy of these conditions. Among the men wage-earners, a vast number are practically denied marriage by the lack of means sufficient for the support of a family in the meagrest comfort. Among the women of the proletariat, tens of thousands are impelled, by the slavery of indigence, to resort to prostitution. This vicious condition of enforced celibacy

for masses of men and women means a practical sterilisation of two classes and the two sexes, which may be temporary or perpetual. It is a gross wastage of a national and social force that should be sanely directed.

If industrialism is at basis a means of providing sustenance for the people, the system should provide for the natural satisfaction of the second imperative human need, the instinct of reproduction, by every possible means. But to profess that modern industrialism is, in essence, a noble scheme for the betterment of humanity is to repeat idle platitude and falsehood. A proposal which appeared lately in *The Spectator*, that the children of the poor should be taken from school and set to work at an early age, in their own interest and that of the community, sheds a true reflection upon the import of latter-day industrialism.

One of the most sinister signs of the times is the ever-tightening grip of the industrial system upon the throats of the wage-earning classes. "Speeding up" is the watchword of a new commercialism that threatens the degeneration of the British race. Men are changing from human personalities into parts of a monstrous machine that pulps flesh and bone. There is no time to live. Even the exploiters and the promoters of industry, themselves to a certain degree the victims of a grotesque and colossal delusion, are discontented and uneasy. We fail more and more to recognise that "a country is infinitely safer, infinitely stronger, infinitely more capable of genuine progress, in which the many are in comfort and content, than that is in which much wealth is accumulated, but the process of distribution is artificially hindered." [1]

The lot of the plebeians of to-day is in some regards rather worse than that of the captive slaves of old. Slave-ownership had its responsibilities towards the serf. A kind of patriarchal benevolence was often shown by the better type of territorial lord in vassaldom, and the villains had definite rights and privileges which the modern peasant lacks. The introduction of machinery and factories deprived the artificer of his chief assets—his deftness in manual labour and his

[1] "Work and Wages," Prof. J. E. Thorold Rogers.

tools. Most of the implements of manufacture are now the property of the rich, and the labourers who work the machines are but parts of the machinery.

The living-in system among shop assistants retards marriage, and in many cases compels celibacy during the best years of life. As an article of property, the slave is valuable. He can be sold. It is to the interest of the owner to provide his serfs with sufficient food, adequate shelter, and some measure of comfort. Beyond the payment of the lowest possible wage, the free wage-earner has no claim upon the employer. How he lives is not the concern of the master, though, in rare instances employers accept a measure of responsibility for the housing and comfort of their workfolk.

The non-existence of celibacy among the ancient Hebrews proves that widespread poverty was not known, and was not, as in modern Gentile states, a marked deterrent of early marriage. Celibacy was not counselled and extolled; on the contrary, the eunuch was excluded from the temple, and the celibate held in disesteem. All ancient secular legislation was opposed to celibacy.

A compulsory celibacy among men was imposed in the age when the sons of nobles and esquires had only the choice of serving in the army or ministering in the Church. The principal cause of widespread celibacy is economic. When a State is reactionary, marriage decreases; when it is progressive, marriage increases. The uniform result may be marked in the history of all civilisations. As the bulk of men, and a fair proportion of women—living in a society in which marriage is made difficult—are celibate only in name, the evils of prostitution, infanticide, abortion, illegitimate births, concubinage, and venereal disease are invariably prominent. *The encouragement of marriage is therefore prophylactic in the broadest sense, and a wise community will strive to remove all possible obstacles to wedlock among the young, the sound, and the fertile.*

In order to combat celibacy, the Romans were forced to foster matrimony among both patricians and plebeians. Augustus fined bachelors heavily, and rewarded paternity. In Sparta celibacy was derided, and at one period it was punishable. All the warlike

nations have feared celibacy as a source of national feebleness and the reduction of population. History will doubtless repeat itself in our own country, and the decimations of war may lead to the encouragement of marriage by the State and society.

"In a state of nature the male is mostly polygamous," says Strindberg. "In most cases there is no obstacle to this, as there is plenty of food for the young ones (beasts of prey excepted); abnormalities, like unmated females, do not exist in nature. But in civilised countries, when a man is lucky if he earns enough bread, it is a common occurrence, especially as the females are in preponderance. One ought to treat unmarried women with kindness, for their lot is a melancholy one."

CHAPTER V

CELIBACY AND MODERN INDUSTRIALISM

Among the inhibitions to marriage poverty must be classed as one of the most palpable and widespread. The struggle to support oneself in the field of unskilled labour, and in several of the learned professions, is so acute that the more intelligent labourers and the more prudent and far-sighted professional men are aware that the possibility of supporting a wife and a family in comfort is beyond their attainment. There are more marriages, and earlier marriages, among the casual and the unskilled workers than among the skilled artisans in regular employment. Hopeless poverty engenders recklessness, and the state of indigence is inimical to mental development. The skilful artificer's aptitude in his occupation is usually accompanied by a general intelligence, an appreciation of thrift, thought for the future, and a sense of social and civic responsibility.

Living from hand to mouth creates a despair of ordered domestic economy. The alleged extravagance and carelessness of those engaged in precarious employments, such as the ruder forms of labour, or the painting of pictures and the writing of serious books, is less the proof of a spendthrift tendency than the evidence of the extreme difficulty of prudent expenditure, when the income is uncertain and future assets purely problematical.

The casual worker in any trade or profession has no assurance of a comfortable competence; but he has the same emotional yearnings and vital needs as the civil servant or the bank clerk, who can count upon a

progressive salary, even though small, and the probability of a pension in old age. Upon economic grounds alone, the man with a varying and uncertain income often reflects that he ought not to marry. But his need for love, his craving for sympathetic companionship, and his desire for a home and family life are often stronger than monetary prudence, and he obeys the conjugal impulse with a daring disregard of consequences.

The ill-paid toiler at irregular tasks, or the impecunious author or artist, mentally discussing his position, comes to the conclusion that, admitting fate will never ensure him with better fortune than he possesses at the moment, and that he is in the prime of life, and, more than all, under the domination of an all-powerful desire, his only course is to cast aside discretion, and to marry immediately.

It is certain that impecuniosity and sheer irremediable necessity restrain a vast multitude of vigorous men and potentially desirable fathers from marrying. Sometimes the conjugal inclination, through long and arduous restraint, becomes less insistent; and at middle age, when the man is in better circumstances, the bachelor life is tolerable, and thoughts of marriage are dispelled. The atrophy of amorous emotion, and sometimes of physical capacity, are the results in many cases of prolonged celibate living. Frequently also the bachelor, whose celibacy has been merely apparent, realises that his irregular life has unfitted him for parentage.

Low wages tend, in a sense, to encourage early marriage among the improvident and the unfit, while they discourage marriage among the provident and the fit. It may be urged that the thrifty, prudent artisan who abstains from wedlock, or defers it to middle age, is not necessarily a better physical type of husband or father than the unskilled labourer. That precarious employment and underpaid work unfit both men and women for marriage and the reproduction of offspring, is proved beyond question.

The mortality rate among those living in chronic poverty, or on "the hunger line," is much higher than among the fairly well-paid workers. We have

seen that poverty, with its invariable result of ill-nutrition and anæmia, is the cause of abortion, premature births, weakly offspring, infant mortality, and specific diseases afflicting both parents and children. Every doctor with experience in midwifery cases among the slum population of our big centres could bring forward a terrible array of evidence upon this matter. Formulated statistics of this suffering and preventable wastage of potential and actual human life would startle and sadden the reflective and the humane.

The inquiry of Mr Charles Booth in London, and of Mr Seebohm Rowntree in York, concerning the problem of poverty in those cities, shows that in the metropolis 30.7 per cent of the people, and in York 27.84, live under conditions that produce a perilously low standard of health. The labouring class " receive upon the average about 25 per cent less food than has been proved by scientific experts to be necessary for the maintenance of physical efficiency." [1]

It is practically proved that " from 25 to 30 per cent of the town populations of the United Kingdom are living in poverty." What does this imply? *It means simply that about* 30 *per cent at least of our community are lacking in stamina, living much below the standard of health, procreating sickly and diseased offspring, failing in fitness for labour, and causing burdens upon the public purse.*

Mr Rowntree estimates that a family of two adults and three children can live in physical efficiency upon twenty-one shillings and eightpence per week. The wages in York for unskilled work "*are insufficient to provide food, shelter and clothing adequate to maintain a family of moderate size in a state of bare physical efficiency.*" This computation of a wage providing " merely physical efficiency " excludes entirely the expenditure of one penny upon luxuries such as newspapers, tobacco, alcohol, finery for the women, or charity and club subscriptions. Yet there are families in all parts of our prosperous kingdom who

[1] " Poverty; A Study of Town Life," B. Seebohm Rowntree. See also " Life and Labour of the People in London," Charles Booth.

are doomed to live upon less than the bare minimum consistent with moderate nutrition and decency.

Reflection upon these facts and figures is a grave danger signal to any intelligent young labourer who dreams of marriage and a home. Marriage under these penurious conditions means dull and incessant toil for man and woman, constant anxiety, perpetual scheming and contriving to get a pennyworth for a penny. The pair cannot afford to be ill. There is no margin for amusement. There is not the slightest hope of putting by a few shillings for a rainy day. Every labourer with three children lives in chronic, depressing poverty for about ten years at least, and both parents and children are underfed. Publicists who insist that we need more sturdy recruits for the army and navy, and business men who demand sturdy labourers and operatives, may be invited to ponder upon this real picture of industrialism.

Good wages promote marriage among the skilled workers, and check the premature unions that low wages tend to induce. It is stated that labourers of under twenty-six marry in the proportion of 58 per cent; whereas skilled craftsmen who marry under that age form 49 per cent. The improvident unions of the young labourers are due to two sources: a desire to escape from the overcrowded home, and a craving for interests and pleasures debarred to them by poverty and monotonous toil.[1]

By a careful inquiry it has been found that 50 per cent of adult wage-earners in regular employment get less than twenty-five shillings per week. Twenty years ago Sir R. Giffen said there were two million families where the total income never exceeded a pound a week.[2] An average family may be reckoned as man and wife and two children. We may estimate that there are eight million people living always on the border-line of starvation. Mrs Pember Reeves, in her painstaking investigation, finds that most of these people are thrifty and hardworking. "Married men

[1] See "Poverty," p. 140.

[2] See "The Living Wage," Philip Snowden, M.P., and "Round about a Pound a Week," Mrs Pember Reeves, for careful evidence as to the social results of inadequate wages.

in full work who keep their job on such a wage do not and cannot drink."

Poverty among the industrious and economical is a terrible evil and injustice. It is a murderous factor. An appalling wastage of human life is the result of low wages. Only eighteen babies per thousand in Hampstead die soon after birth. In Hoxton the child mortality is one hundred and forty per thousand.

The Board of Trade returns for 1911 show that 63 per cent of men employed by railway companies earn less than twenty-five shillings per week. In 1907 field labourers earned eighteen and fourpence a week, reckoning all allowances. And middle-class men say that they cannot maintain a family on five hundred pounds a year!

The encouragement of the marriage of the physically fittest, well-nourished and more intelligent, can be achieved by providing the wage-earners with adequate means and facilities in obtaining homes. All over our country-side there are complaints of the scarcity of available cottages. Young couples willing to marry are compelled to wait indefinitely till a dwelling becomes vacant. Starvation wages, physical deterioration, and the lack of homes discourage marriage in both town and country. People cannot marry without a roof to shelter them and their families. In a chapter on The Economic Remedy, I shall endeavour to deal with the housing question.

The living-in system in business houses, especially in the drapery trade, forms one of the hindrances to marriage among a large class of the employed. Owing to the scarcity of small houses at reasonable rents, a mass of workers are forced to live in lodgings. Long years, and sometimes the whole life, are spent in one squalid apartment known as a "bed-sitting-room." The rents of these rooms in cities is almost always higher than the rent of a four or five-roomed cottage and garden in the country.

Single men living in lodgings have no home companionship and few interests in the substitute for a home in which they pass dreary hours. The public-house is the nightly refuge of millions of men who are debarred from marriage and family life. Celibate

loneliness is often unbearable. A man craves company, and he seeks it among his fellows in the bar. The habit of drinking is fostered in this way; and the desire for alcoholic stimulation may last for the whole of life, and become a pathological obsession. There is no doubt that celibacy leads many sociable persons into drinking habits. Secret tippling is common among lonely and disappointed single women and widows.

The army of young, virile celibate males brings about the widespread prostitution of unmarried women. Wherever men are segregated, or living in compulsory celibacy, the courtesans of the streets abound. Seaports and garrison towns are their hunting grounds. Indirectly, the ravaging diseases incidental to this traffic are the effect of celibacy.

The unmarried woman of the wage-earning class is in an even harder position than the unmarried man. A formidable code of feminine propriety debars her from most of the pleasures and relaxations permitted to the men of her class. If she strolls or loiters in the street, she is in danger of solicitation. If she frequents the public-house, she incurs a suspicion of light conduct, or of intemperance. Her single, comfortless, lonely room is her only resting-place after the labour of the day. In sheer desperation, induced by monotony and a solitary life, numbers of compulsorily celibate women drift into occasional or habitual prostitution.

It becomes more difficult, amidst the complexities of everyday industrial existence, for men and women to lead a normal and healthy sex life. Prolonged celibacy develops hyperæsthesia and morbidities in both sexes, and tends to anæsthesia and atrophy in women. Anæmia, through want of adequate and suitable nourishment, unfits a great number of young women for marriage and maternity. This condition presents several abnormal phenomena well known to experienced doctors. Long-continued poor living may result in a psychic aversion to love and wedlock. Every alienist and psychopathist is familiar with the symptoms, the nervous and mental lesions, psychic complexes, and hysterical signs in celibate patients, who have no inkling of their state and its cause.

CELIBACY AND INDUSTRIALISM

All the perversions, morbidities and abnormalities of the sexual instinct are fostered and increased in communities that comprise a large proportion of unmarried persons. It is a fatal mistake to accept the apparent celibacy of the higher civilisations as actual. Pseudo-celibacy is always far more common, especially among men, than positive or true celibacy.

It is the duty of society to provide for the healthy fulfilment of the second primary human desire.[1] There is no law against wedlock for single persons who are unrelated by blood; and theoretically marriage is regarded as man's proper destiny and a social duty. Nevertheless it is increasingly difficult to marry and to support a family in even the minimum of comfort. Modern industrial conditions have multiplied occupations that are not in the nature of crafts or trades. These blind-alley employments lead to nowhere.

As examples of callings that offer little or no security, and are almost entirely devoid of promise of ultimate betterment, serving in shops and the work of the rank and file of clerks may be cited. Many shop assistants earn less than artisans. Some are paid at the same rate as unskilled labourers, or even less. At the age of thirty-five, a provident and capable shop assistant may consider that he is in a position to take a wife. When he reaches forty, he will probably discover that many employers have no use for the services of men of that age; and loss of employment will bring disaster to his family in the first years of wedlock.

Glancing back at industrial life in the fifteenth century, we find that artisans and labourers were better remunerated comparatively than they are nowadays. It is instructive that, at this period, there was regard to the fact that living in London was costlier than in the country. The wages in London were from 25 to 30 per cent higher than those paid in the rural

[1] Dr A. Jacobi stated to the American Medical Association, 1912: "Modern industry reduces the vigour and vitality of men, and woman and child labour exhausts the mothers and fathers of the future and present generations. Millions of men are prevented from contracting marriage by pecuniary want."

districts. "At no time," says Professor Thorold Rogers, "were wages, relatively speaking, so high, and at no time was food so cheap."

The English working man, in the fifteenth century and the first part of the sixteenth, worked eight hours of the day. He was paid for Sundays and holidays, when he did not labour. Food was often given in addition to wages. At this time there arose the master artisan, who owned capital and could purchase material for use in his craft. In 1536 there was a law that landowners should construct farm buildings for tenants.

Marriage was encouraged and facilitated by the trade guilds, which employed a part of their funds in endowing marriage and in providing portions for widows. There was also relief for necessitous members of the craft. "Relatively speaking, the working man of to-day is not so well off as he was in the fifteenth century, when the population was not one-tenth of what it is now." [1]

In this age of prosperity in England there is evidence that regard was paid to the question of a fair living wage, and the probability of marriage was taken into account. To-day the employer is not concerned with the question whether his assistant or servant earns enough to live in accordance with natural law. Wages and salaries are not fixed upon any probability of marriage.

Even when husband and wife work in factories, the wages in some industries do not suffice to keep the family in decent comfort. The woman is in a constant condition of fatigue, and generally unfit to bear healthy children. Referring to this evil, in "The White Slaves of England," Mr R. H. Sherard says: "So poor are the wages, that in hundreds of families in Bradford both husband and wife have to work in the factories, the husband at night, the wife by day. No better device for the separation of the sexes could have been invented. . . . One may imagine the home-life of such husbands and such wives."

The great influx of women into the field of industrial

[1] See "Work and Wages" (Chapter II), J. E. Thorold Rogers.

labour and business life is a grave problem. In two ways the increase of women-workers tends to augment the celibate army. It relieves women of dependence upon their sex, or marriageable value, as their only asset, and frees them, to a large extent, from the servile condition that oppresses most women who are economically dependent upon man. On the other hand, female employment outside of the home, and the earning of wages which are sometimes sufficient for the support of the woman-worker, causes a postponement of marriage, and frequently yields content with the single life.

More serious is the hindrance imposed by woman's labour upon the marriage of men. The young man in almost every calling is faced not only by the competition of his own sex, but he has to compete for employment with the other sex. Directly and indirectly, the entrance of women into the labour market has been advantageous; but we must not close our eyes to the evils that accompany women's participation in work that was once the exclusive occupation of men. This competition of the sexes for employment is among the factors of celibacy and late marriage.

One of the gravest dangers of women's occupation in robust forms of labour, and in work that is injurious to health, is the effect upon the working mothers and their children. In primitive societies the child-bearer is sheltered and protected. The hunter and breadwinner is exposed to peril in the chase and in warfare; but the mothers of the tribe are generally absolved from such hardships and dangers during child-bearing and the care of the young. Women throughout the globe have their own natural heritage of suffering and risk to life. Maternity is a process complicated in a high degree by civilised existence, refinement and luxury. In giving life thousands of women are sacrificed for the race. Some lose their lives, many are made invalids or valetudinarians for life.

The care of the mothers scarcely enters into our industrial economy. It is hardly an exaggeration that the free wage-earner is in a worse position in this

respect than the purchased slave. Some occupations followed by women, as their only alternative to starvation, are unsuitable for potential or actual mothers. In manufacturing districts, where the earnings of the men are inadequate for the maintainance of a wife and family, women are forced into ill-paid labour. While I am by no means opposed to the labour of women, I would urge that woman's work must be adapted to her specific sex limitations, and so ordered that rest during pregnancy, and leisure for home life while the children are young, shall be imperative rules.

Severe muscular exertion is often dangerous to women during the puerperal life. Woman's organism and nervous system cannot resist strain and the effects of high-pressure toil so readily as the masculine frame and nerves. Modern industrialism takes little or no account of this important fact. "Hands" are required for the capitalist employer, and always the female "hand" is cheaper than the male, and usually quite as efficient. The sterilisation of women, and the risks, diseases and sufferings of the mothers of the community, arising from several industries, call for immediate remedy. It is useless to demand more births while we sterilise women, or expose them to industrial injuries that induce still-births, child mortality and other evils.

The life of the women chain-makers in the Black Country is a disgrace to civilisation. One of them remarked to Mr Sherard: "We are working worse nor slaves, and getting nothing to eat into the bargain." A friend of this woman said that "a halfpennyworth of oatmeal often served as a meal for a whole family." Women suckling their babes work at this industry, and earn less than their childless companions. "For forging dog-chains, and attaching the swivels and rings, girls receive three farthings apiece. Ten hours of heavy toil produce six chains."[1]

Women white lead workers often die of poisoning. Sooner or later they become anæmic invalids; many are paralysed, others are partially or totally blind, and some are insane. "The percentage of deaths is higher amongst the lead workers than in any other

[1] "The White Slaves of England."

industry, and not half the deaths directly caused by the poison enter into the official statistics, as the men are dismissed the week before they are actually moribund." [1]

White lead poisoning threatens the fecundity of the women-workers, and is the cause of diseases inimical to healthy motherhood and the production of sound offspring. These deadly employments, and several others, are all very badly paid. The toothless, prematurely aged, bronchitic alkali workers of Widnes were paid 50 per cent less wages in 1897 than they received five or six years previously. We should not be surprised to learn that manufacturers' profits have risen considerably.

Irregular, badly rewarded, injurious occupations foster enforced celibacy, disorder the reproductive function, deteriorate national stamina, stimulate the drink craving, induce sexual vices, and burden posterity with physical, mental, and moral ills that cannot be calculated. Until our industrial order is thoroughly reconstructed on sane, humane and equitable principles, the menace of race degeneration and infant mortality cannot be averted.

Women's labour, involving internal strain, is a not uncommon cause of the disturbance and displacement of important organs. The frequency of falling of the uterus, and of malposition, must be regarded as a grave social question of to-day. This malady is extremely common, not only among wives but among unmarried women. Certain occupations expose women to this risk. Prolapsus of the womb is one of the causes of sterility. Its influence upon the health of the afflicted is very palpable, and its sway upon the mind and emotions is remarkable. If statistics of the prevalence of this disorder could be published, the figures would startle social reformers and all who are in earnest concerning the welfare of the mothers of the nation.

Advocacy of marriage may be contested on the reasonable plea that more marriages might result in

[1] Op. cit. See also "Maternity," "Letters from Working Women," and "Married Women's Work," edited by Clementina Black.

an excess of population and an intensification of the struggle for subsistence. This contention demands our serious heed. Over-population is the menace and the bane of the older civilised nations, and is perhaps more to be dreaded than a steady decrease in numbers. The decline of early marriage in England has undoubtedly affected the birth-rate.

In 1896 the average age of marriage for men was 28.43. Statistics show that in 1909 the mean age was 28.88. For women in 1896 the age was 26.21, and in 1909 26.69. The point of the greatest importance is that in 1909 the marriage of the young, that is to say minors, stood at 39.8 husbands and 217.0 wives in one thousand unions.

In all races the mothers of from fifteen to thirty are the most fecund. Late marriage usually means fewer children. Fertility diminishes with the advancing age of the mothers. It has been stated that the postponement of marriage among the well-to-do classes accounts for 50 per cent of the low birth-rate figures in those classes.

The chief checks on the birth-rate are (1) Restriction upon the number of the family by preventive means;[1] (2) Delay in marriage among women; (3) The lowering of vitality and stamina among the increasing town populations; (4) Congenital sterility of parents; (5) Infecundity largely induced by venereal and other diseases.

There is no question that the artificial limitation of families among the upper class, middle class, and a growing number of prosperous and prudent artisans is one main cause of the decline in births.[2] The postponement of marriage means that many women marrying late in life may have fewer in family than a smaller number of women marrying at an early age. Urban life provides a check inasmuch as it reduces the energy

[1] For an excellent examination of the causes of a falling birth-rate, see "The Task of Social Hygiene," Chapter V, by Havelock Ellis, 1912.

[2] Dr J. Quayle Dealey, in "The Development of the State," states that "the higher social classes tend to restrict the number of their offspring either by natural or unnatural means." Mr Sidney Webb and other economists have investigated this growing factor of restriction of population.

and power that urge to marriage and propagation. It is well known that city populations would decay were it not for the constant admixture of healthy blood and sound nerves from the country-side.

During the Boer War only 10 per cent out of eleven thousand young men in Manchester were found fit to enlist.[1] Only two out of five who enlisted were found efficient soldiers at the end of two years' training. The salvation of cities is in the higher vitality of rural immigrants.

What may be called natural sterility is one of the minor causes of a reduction in births; but the impotence and infecundity induced by disease form a far more frequent source than physiological incapacity. It is now ascertained beyond any doubt that the virus of gonorrhea is an extremely common cause of sterile marriage. As this complaint ranks second in frequency to measles, its widespread prevalence calls for ardent consideration of the social causes that bring about this infection of tens of thousands. That marriage is, in a measure, prophylactic is proved by the fact that the affection is comparatively scarce among married working men. Its prevalence among married men in other classes is high.

A high birth-rate cannot be well maintained in a community that postpones marriage. Unfortunately the early and imprudent marriage of the helplessly poor and ill-fed is often prolific. The marrying class is nowadays the class that lacks the physiological qualifications for parentage. The better-paid, well-nourished, provident artisans are marrying later in life, and producing fewer offspring than the slum natives. Professional men, doctors, solicitors, clergymen, authors, artists, teachers and brain-workers are forced in large numbers to defer wedlock till middle age, or even later.

A fall in the marriage-rate and the postponement of marriage are, generally speaking, indications of a declining commercial prosperity. But it must be pointed out that times of plenty often produce thrift, forethought in expenditure, and an accompanying eleva-

[1] See article in *Lancet*, 23rd September, 1882.

tion of the standard of living that restrict the number of marriages. If prosperity is prolonged, as Ellis suggests, there is a tendency towards economy in reproduction. In other words, the rich restrict the number of their children, because affluence gives rise to a host of complex desires which cannot be gratified readily if the family is large. To return to the unpremeditated reproductive activity of half a century ago might cause a regrowth of several evils. Mr Charles Booth sees hope in a falling birth-rate in urban centres.

The encouragement of marriage should be based upon the belief that marriage is a supreme human need, and that compulsory celibacy is an imperfect and often injurious mode of life for the individual and the race. Wedlock, being compatible with the highest state of health of mind and body, is in itself beneficial to the whole community, even apart from the fact that it is the cause of the continuance of the race. Certain writers in newspapers who inscribe doleful lamentations on decadence, due to the falling off of the population in numbers, and the wealthy employers who desire cheap labour, are wont to regard the recommendation to marriage merely as a means for raising the rate of birth. The purely industrial, economic or military motive is the inspiration of most pleas for promoting marriage. "We want more factory hands." "We need more people on the land." "We require more soldiers and sailors."

Only a few sociologists and humanist reformers recognise that we need more men as husbands for the vast number of involuntarily celibate women doomed to lonely, loveless existence and the negation of the right to motherhood. Only the thoughtful and the far-seeing recognise that love is as essential as light, air, and sufficient food; and that the frustration of normal impulses of soul and body, through grave but remediable artificial hindrances, is even more alarming than the sinking birth-rate.[1]

Where is the economy in fostering a high birth-rate

[1] "Early marriage, apart from its more ideal character, is the one and only possibility of reducing or eliminating the evil of prostitution, which evil has defied all other efforts to check it."—"The Small Family System," Dr C. V. Drysdale.

when the conditions of life produce a high death-rate? The increase of population in Germany is due to a fall in the death-rate. At periods in England when the marriage-rate has been high, the birth-rate has been low. In 1909, in the United Kingdom, there were 313,302 marriages and 1,145,900 births. In 1910 there was a higher marriage-rate, 320,699, but the births dropped to 1,222,925. In 1911 there were still more marriages, 329,986, and the births were some thousands less, i.e. 1,104,986.

In Lancashire, Staffordshire and other industrial districts the mortality among children is very high. This mortality is largely preventable. Puericulture is beginning to save the lives of thousands of babies annually, by instruction in hygiene among mothers, and the insistence on rest during pregnancy. It is senseless to tell women that it is their duty to marry in order to bear children, and to surround women, during pregnancy and lactation, with all kinds of injurious influences upon mother and child. "A high infantile mortality denotes a far higher infantile deterioration-rate," says Carpenter, an authority on the diseases of children.

A high birth-rate appears to result normally in a high death-rate. "The high infantile mortality of the community with a high birth-rate," writes Havelock Ellis, "merely means that that community is unconsciously making a violent and murderous effort to attain to the more stable and organised level of the country with a low birth-rate."

Immature parentage is injurious to society. The inexperienced adolescent is not a capable parent, either physically or mentally. Early unions often spell penury for the couple; and in many cases, among the extremely poor, the wife is actually driven to prostitution in order to earn a few shillings for the support of the children. Premature marriage is unfortunately most common among the poorest, whose very poverty and hopelessness render them reckless.

In the advocacy and advancement of marriage, great discrimination must be employed as a safeguard against too early wedlock and precocity in reproduction. Although the nubile age for women begins in some

instances before the legal adult age, it may be stated that, as a general rule, it is not in the interest of the race that many women should bear children before the age of twenty. The best marrying age for women is fixed by some physiologists and physicians at twenty-one. After forty-five the great majority of women are no longer capable of maternity, so that the healthiest child-bearing period in a woman's life is from twenty to thirty-five years of age. The finest offspring are born to women under the age of thirty-five.

Lucas indicates signs of premature senility in the children of the old.[1] Marro says that the children of fathers past their prime tend to develop mental disease, idiocy and criminal habits. It is said that 52.9 per cent of murderers descend from fathers in the decline of life. Dr S. A. K. Strahan states that, "The most perfect, robust and long-lived children are those of fathers between twenty-five and forty, and mothers between twenty and thirty years."[2] The eminent physician, J. Matthews Duncan, fixed the mature marrying age in women at twenty to twenty-five, and in men five years later.

If a man postpones matrimony to the period between forty and fifty, he should marry a partner of from twenty-five to thirty. When both parents have passed the hygienic conjugal age, the children usually suffer in body and mind. It must be recognised, however, that some men of fifty, with elastic, unimpaired arteries and sound viscera, are more virile and physically younger than many men of thirty or less. Nevertheless, there is almost certainly a lessening of male reproductive vigour after the age of forty-five, though a man may be robust and energetic of body and mind.

A diminution of the death-rate, which is as important as the maintenance of a balanced birth-rate, is aided by the encouragement of marriage at the fitting age. Early marriage, the union of adolescents of both sexes, especially among the under-nourished and weakly, is bad economy in the reproductive force of

[1] "Traite Philosophique de L'Hérédité."

[2] "Marriage and Disease." Mantegazza in "The Art of Taking a Wife," says that the man should be from twenty-five to thirty-five; the woman from eighteen to twenty-five.

the nation. Conjugal union of middle-aged men and women of over thirty-five is equally undesirable when the procreative function is exercised. By taking care of marriage we can provide a normal life for the adult, lessen the mortality of infancy and maturity, and diminish disease.

"The religious and social institution of marriage," as Buckle pointed out in his "History of Civilisation in England," and as statistics show in every nation, is not only regulated but entirely controlled by the price of food and the rate of wages. Marriage is, therefore, an economic and industrial question coming within the domain of legislation. It is a subject of social ethics, and a theme alike for the ecclesiastic and the scientific moralist.

CHAPTER VI

THE EXTENT OF CELIBACY

The number of unmarried persons in England and Wales, in 1911, was 20,963,807 out of 36,070,492. Married persons numbered 13,126,070, and the widowed 1,980,615. Unmarried women were twenty-nine in excess of every thousand unmarried men. In London there are 1127 females married and single to every thousand married and bachelor males. England and Wales, at the last census, contained 1068 females to 1000 males. "Of the adult women in the country, one quarter never marry."[1]

Among the counties where women largely preponderate, Sussex is a notable instance. In the towns, Bournemouth shows the highest record of single women, i.e. 486 per 1000. Rotherham has the largest number of wives in proportion to population, and Leicester contains the fewest bachelors. In a few mining districts men outnumber women.

The great decline in the birth-rate is attributed by the Registrar-General to a slight fall in the marriage-rate, a fall in the number of illegitimate births, decreased fertility of wives, due in part to the later age of marriage to-day, and to deliberate restriction of child-bearing. Infant mortality is high. In Scotland it is higher than ever.

The population of the United Kingdom, 2nd April, 1911, was 45,211,888. The increase since the census of 1901 was 3,757,944 or 9.1 per cent.

[1] "The Women's Charter," Lady McLaren.

BIRTH-RATE, ENGLAND AND WALES.

		Rate per 1000 of the Population.
1909	914,472	25.8
1910	896,962	25.1
1911	881,241	24.4
1912	872,767	23.8

BIRTH-RATE, UNITED KINGDOM.

		Rate per 1000 of the Population.
1909	1,145,900	25.7
1910	1,122,925	25.0
1911	1,104,986	24.4
1912	1,096,517	24.1
1913	1,102,123	23.9

MARRIAGE-RATE, UNITED KINGDOM (1907 TO 1913).

		Rate per 1000 of the Population.
1907	332,228	15.2
1908	319,280	14.5
1909	313,302	14.1
1910	320,699	14.3
1911	329,986	14.6
1912	338,988	14.8
1913	342,247	14.9

During the past thirty years there has been a great decrease in the number of men marrying under the age of twenty-five.

The tendency to postpone marriage is not only notable in our own society. This disposition is shown on the Continent. The legal age of marriage is usually fixed in civilised states at the attainment of puberty. Thus in Prussia girls are considered nubile at fifteen, and young men at twenty. In France the earliest marrying age is eighteen for males, and fifteen for females; but such early wedlock is not common. Most of the French writers upon sexual hygiene condemn matrimony for women of sixteen or even eighteen.

According to Dr Garnier, the proper age for a man to marry is between twenty-five and thirty-three, and for a woman from twenty to twenty-six. He states that, in the eighteenth century, the mean age of marriage for men in Paris was twenty-nine, and for women twenty-four. After the statistical inquiry of 1857 to 1860, the age of wedlock had risen among men to thirty years and six months, and among women to

twenty-six years and two months. In the cities of France marriages are contracted at a later age than in the rural parts.

Premature conjugality is a factor of mortality in France, as elsewhere. This influence is most marked among women, the death-rate being 11.86 per 1000 for wives of from fifteen to twenty, against 7.35 for maidens. In the racial interest, Garnier advocates legal prohibition of adolescent marriage.

MARRIAGES IN VARIOUS COUNTRIES (1905 TO 1911)

	1905	1906	1907	1908	1909	1910	1911
FRANCE—	302,623	306,487	314,061	315,641	307,687	307,710	307,788
SPAIN—	136,897	138,484	136,323	141,046	129,528	139,176	142,119
ITALY—	255,873	260,780	260,104	283,160	266,101	269,024	260,000
TOTAL GERMAN EMPIRE—	485,906	498,990	503,964	500,620	494,127	496,396	——

The marriage-rate per 1000 in France from 1909 to 1911 was uniformly 7.8; Spain, 6.7, 7.1, 7.2; Italy, 7.7, 7.7, 7.5.[1] The birth-rate in Spain, per 1000, was for the three years, 35.5, 31.1, 31.8. In the United Kingdom, 25.7, 25.0, 24.4. In these three years Spain had a considerably higher death-rate than that of the United Kingdom.

Spain is a nation of marrying people, as shown by statistics covering a hundred years. Marriage is early, especially among the peasants, who are now married in great and increasing numbers through the civil form. The religious ceremony costs twenty-five pesetas, a large sum to a Spanish working man.

The statistics of Holland, Belgium and Switzerland prove that most divorced persons marry again. Second marriages of widowers and widows show high figures in Switzerland. In Holland, about thirty years ago, statistics proved that widows have a far greater chance of marriage than spinsters. Among women

[1] In Italy the average marriage age of women is twenty-five years, showing a steady tendency to the postponement of wedlock.

of from twenty-five to twenty-nine years, the weddings of spinsters were 115 per 1000, while those of widows were 157 per 1000. The tendency to remarriage is fairly equal in most of the European countries.

Certain zones appear to stimulate marriage, while others favour celibacy. It is often remarked of some provincial towns, "This is not a marrying place." Mothers with marriageable daughters often take them on visits to localities where there are more chances of meeting with suitors. Country candidates for matrimony sometimes resort to the towns to seek for partners, while townsfolk of like inclination pay visits to the villages. Frequently there is prejudice in both sexes against the selection of a companion in marriage from the town in which they reside. One hears the statement: "I wouldn't marry a girl from this place on any account." Provincial town life seems to promote a kind of contempt or distrust of neighbours, which may be the outcome of familiarity. The instinct of wandering for the object of wooing is fairly common, and this instinct counteracts to some extent the dangers of intermarriage that exist in thinly populated parts of the country. An inquiry into the comparative number of the sexes unmarried in given districts and towns should be useful to single men and women who contemplate the quest for a mate. For example, men might pursue the search in Sussex or Bournemouth, where single women abound. Women should avoid Leicester, where most men are married, and visit those quarters where, through the nature of the occupations, more men than women are to be found. Some of the Colonies have a considerable overplus of bachelors who wish to be benedicts.

The disproportion of the sexes is often attributed to a higher birth-rate among females than males. Universally speaking this is quite incorrect, for in almost all parts of the globe there is an excess of males at birth. Among animals such excess is not uncommon. Nature is, however, anxious to preserve the female, the chief agent in reproduction; and her solicitude is shown by the fact that women are more tenacious of life than men. The "stronger sex" are only strong in the sense of muscular superi-

ARMY MEDICAL LIBRARY
379608
WASHINGTON, D. C. U. S. A.

ority, and in certain resistances; their alleged strength does not render them less mortal than women, or so long-lived.

In England there are born more boys than girls. About fifty years ago it was estimated that males born in this country were in excess of females by about five per hundred. About twenty years ago there were born about three more boys than girls per hundred. The preponderance of male births persists, though diminishing slightly, in the United Kingdom, France, and Germany.

Figures published some years ago, stating the proportion of the sexes born in various countries of Europe, revealed a curious uniformity of 105 boys to every 100 girls in seventeen kingdoms and provinces. The statistics for Italy, Austria, Norway, and other nations showed that the proportion of males born exceeded the females by six in every hundred. Greece had the highest male birth-rate, 112 to 100 females. Among the Jewish people the male birth-rate is very considerably higher than among Christians.

Female infants are less liable to die than male infants. Still-births are far more frequent among males than females. Soon after birth, boys show a stronger liability to death than do girls. From the beginning of puberty to the twentieth year there are more deaths among females than males; but after thirty women enjoy a better chance of life than men. The comparative immunity from infantile mortality, the resistance to disease, and recuperative vigour, tend to produce a redundance of women. Throughout most of their lives men are more apt than women to die of illness or injury. The disvulnerability of women is one proof of their physical infantilism. Surgeons have noted that children stand operations better than adults, and that women recover more quickly and die less frequently after amputations.[1] Physiologically, women are apparently shaped by Nature to bear pain, to resist disease, and to recover from illness more readily than men.

It is sometimes said, especially by women, that men

[1] See "Man and Woman," Havelock Ellis, and "Nervous Organisation," Dr Henry Campbell.

are more exposed to the grave illnesses common to both sexes through their irregular lives and intemperance. The same cause is suggested as accounting for men's shorter span of life.

Jean Finot, author of "Problems of the Sexes," declares insistently that man kills himself prematurely by his excesses and abuses of passion. He is damaged by the "hidden wounds of voluptuousness." That many men are utterly unheedful of the risks of dissipations of all kinds, and that many die untimely, through ailments induced by excesses, is perfectly true. But it would be difficult to prove that the higher mortality among men, at certain stages of life and in advanced old age, is chiefly, or even very greatly, the result of unrestraint. The mortal age for men is in infancy and senility, the periods when excess is impracticable.

It is unquestionably correct to say that many women become ill and curtail their lives through the serious injuries and displacements of organs, and the costal respiration caused by tight-lacing, their lack of physical exercise, unhygienic diet, and want of fresh air; but these factors do not bulk enormously in a general examination of the mortality of women. The secondary sexual characteristics are the chief determinants of the disvulnerability, recuperative vigour, and the prolongation of life in women. Nature is interested in keeping women alive. Census reports show that there are twice as many women centenarians as men.

War decimates males, and the maintenance of standing armies and navies involves male segregation and celibacy. Men's toil in the mines, quarries, ironworks, and in dangerous employments of several kinds exposes them to violent deaths. The sea takes a heavy annual toll of men's lives. Emigration from old countries thins the male population of many of its more vigorous types. Nature contrives that women shall be redundant. Men are even handicapped at the moment of birth by the size of their skulls. They are more liable than women to Bright's disease, diabetes, sciatica, appendicitis, asthma, and smallpox. Among women cancer is more frequent than among men, and this disease is perhaps the only one common to both sexes from which they suffer more than men. Cancer

has, however, a tendency to become more prevalent in men.

Intense devotion to parents has been noted by Freud, Brill, and other observers as a predisposing cause of celibacy. The youth deeply attached to his mother is wont to idealise all her qualities. He seeks in his bride a replica of his mother; and in some instances men have declared that they have remained bachelors because they could not discover a woman who compared with the maternal ideal. The same phenomenon has been noticed among women who idealise their fathers. As a rule, these persons are only children, and it is upon the single child that most parents lavish a demonstrative affection. A very considerable proportion of celibates of both sexes are the only children born to their parents. We may argue perhaps from this, that late marriages, resulting in the birth of a single child, are one of the minor sources of celibacy.

CHAPTER VII

THE GREAT UNMARRIED AND SOCIETY

DISCOURAGEMENT and embarrassment of marriage are not only authoritative and official, as in the instances of the Church and the law, for society itself renders conjugal unions difficult. The bulk of people in modern industrial communities have lost the art of life. Men have no time to live, and often no strong inclination to live. Work is idealised, exalted, and worshipped as the supreme end of life. We are taught that life is labour. We should learn that life is also love and leisure.

Modern commercial society dreads leisure. It prefers "speeding up," unremitting, factitious activity, high pressure, overstrain, and chaotic bustle. L. Sera, a thoughtful Italian writer, says wisely that all good and beautiful things grow out of leisure. To love, to study, to adorn life, to wrest secrets from Nature, to worship and to develop spiritually, men and women require adequate leisure. The mere getting of shelter, food, and clothing absorbs the whole energy of vast masses of the population. After a day's labour many are too tired to live. The worker is a mere skinful of aching bones and weary muscles. His brain is almost comatose. He flies to alcohol for relief, for a temporary exhilaration, or for an anodyne. Intemperance in work produces intemperance in drink. The public-house is an admirable institution of the industrial state, and not without reason is the reduction in licences opposed by many of the possessing classes. The bar provides a nepenthe that keeps the proletariat from worrying unduly about their status. Drink instils transitory euphoria and bliss.

Work-fever and work-inebriety induce febrile and insane yearnings for false pleasures, excitements, and the possession of costly, yet often worthless, objects and encumbrances. A man will slave, scheme, and cheat to purchase foolish gewgaws. He will miss the glory of the sunrise, the beauty of the rose, and all the free gifts of Nature, to win a trumpery and vulgar station in an ugly suburb. Women barter their souls and bodies for the gratification of social ostentation. Amid all this vehement and fatuous striving for material superfluities, discontent, chagrin and unhappiness increase and are deepened among millions of human beings.

It is a fallacy that the majority of mankind are naturally inert. A repugnance to imperative labour, to irksome occupation, and to incessant toil is common enough, but this repugnance is not necessarily and always an indication of an idle disposition. The youth who hates office work, and performs it badly, will strive with all his energy in a more congenial employment. A rich man, with no positive need to work, will often expend as much, or more, activity upon self-imposed employments than the victim of sheer necessity who must work or starve. Humanity in the mass is not naturally idle. The weak and the poor are not permitted idleness. Absolute want makes them the prey of the stronger and the wealthy, as shown in slavery, ancient and modern. It is a sad fact that culture—which requires leisure, or, in other words, relief from the common task of providing material necessities—has been built up on the warped frames of countless industrial labourers. While men have counted the stars, discussed the problems of life, discovered the forces of Nature, written books, and painted pictures, other men and women have drudged to supply their daily needs. In the future let us hope that there will be an equitable division of necessary toil, or an economic readjustment that will liberally reward those who perform the rude, unpleasing, and often dangerous tasks.

Methodical imposed activity is repellent to many strong natures, not through inertia, but through the operation of creative energy, which demands slow gestation. Thus the organiser of a large business

may seem idle, when compared with a methodical and industrious clerk, who works regularly for eight or nine hours each day.

The newly discovered plant food and stimulant, known as humogen, which enormously increases the yield of wheat and vegetables, may bring about marvellous changes in the production of aliment. Berthelot has foreshadowed a state, not altogether Utopian in conception, when science will reduce the immense toil of procuring nutrition to a simple process that may be likened to child's play. There is yet hope that our posterity will have time to live, and enjoy love, sunshine, and flowers.

There is no doubt that the struggle to obtain food could be lessened by individual effort, and such effort would encourage marriage. In the same way several of the social obstacles to matrimony could be diminished. Some of our standards of living are absurd in the extreme. There are natural and social tyrannies enough without voluntarily setting up others. The bugbears of Respectability and Gentility literally scare a multitude from the enjoyment of life. Worship of material things obscures the finer spiritual issues. The dull-witted Moneybag, in his plethoric satiety, misses even the pleasures of his sumptuous table, and often envies the ploughman's healthy enjoyment of the plainest fare. The enervated, feeble woman of the rich, indolent class, though surrounded with luxuries, is usually not so happy as the robust dairymaid.

Conventional estimates of the income adequate for the comfort of a family vary in every class from the highest to the lowest. The middle-class bachelor, who confesses that he "can just make both ends meet" on an income of £500 a year, will probably require a yearly revenue of three times the amount before he marries. One clerk will make "a fireside clime" with thirty-five shillings a week; another will tell you that he cannot marry on less than four pounds a week. Inquiry among struggling professional men, tradesmen and clerks, shows that many postpone marriage, or dispense with it wholly, because they cannot find women who are willing to share their impecuniosity. A common excuse for living the bachelor life is the

alleged growing extravagance of women, their social ambition, gentility, or love of money.

This imputation of mercenary calculation on the part of the women of to-day demands consideration. The plainest possible speaking on this matter is to be found in Olive Schreiner's "Woman and Labour," and in Charlotte Perkins Gilman's "Women and Economics." In the first-named book we shall find the "fine lady," the human female parasite, described as "the most deadly microbe which can make its appearance on the surface of any social organism." The parasitism is related by Olive Schreiner to the phenomenon of prostitution. Both of these feminist writers lay emphasis on the over-sexed state of women in the higher civilisations. Sex has constituted the supreme value of woman in the esteem of man. Woman, through her economic need, and often through her idleness and love of ease, has accepted this appraisement. "The mercenary marriage," writes Mrs Gilman, "is a perfectly natural consequence of the economic dependence of women." The writer, in noting the effect of the dependence of women upon men, continues: "As the excessive sex-distinction and economic dependence of women increase, so do the risk and difficulty of marriage increase, and so is marriage deferred and avoided, to the direct injury of both sexes and society at large."

In the country, as Mrs Gilman points out, the young farmer obtains a "profitable servant when he marries," whereas the "young business man gets nothing of the kind—a pretty girl, a charming girl, ready for wifehood and motherhood, so far as her health holds out, but having no economic value whatever."

The typical parasitic woman is less evident than she was fifty or even five-and-twenty years ago. Feminism is cutting at the roots of the sexual dependence that made women mere purchasable articles, highly expensive, but necessary to men. The middle-class girls, living at home, without definite occupation, are becoming fewer every year. Nevertheless, the "sexuo-economic" estimate of women, as Mrs Gilman has it, still prevails widely. Its growth has been so slow that its decay will inevitably be lingering.

We all know the snobbish, vulgar families wherein paterfamilias scorns the idea of "female employment," except for the women working in his factory, or in domestic servitude. We are acquainted with the young women of these abodes of female parasitism, who are instructed from their nurseries that the proper duty of woman is to accentuate by every means the fact that they are feminine creatures. We know the tricks, the shifts, the pitiable devices of the mothers to further "good marriages" for their daughters. We have seen the daughters devote themselves assiduously to the cultivation of their charms for the capture of men: the intense preoccupation with dress and finery, the mincing before the mirror, the elaborate arranging of the hair, the constant anxiety about the complexion, and experimentation with numerous cosmetics, beauty producers, face creams and powders. Bejewelled, scented, decked in alluring costumes, they sit, with vacuous, artificial smiles, awaiting "the desirable suitor."

I do not present this picture for the derision of men. My sex deserves what it gets in this matter. Men have wanted pink-cheeked, simpering inanity; they shaped the noble being Woman in this guise through centuries of misnamed chivalry and gallantry. They have crushed the soul, starved and distorted the mind, and cramped the body of Woman, and she has acquiesced, yielded, and obeyed the behest of her supporter, Man, through imperious necessity.

This over-sexing of women, which men lament as a bar to marriage on a small income, will vanish slowly with the influx of more women into professions and trades. I believe that the costliness of maintaining wives is often greatly overestimated. In the huge army of unmarried women, there are many thousands who are prepared to face even poverty as the price of love, homelife, and motherhood. And there is surely a thinkable method whereby men of moderate means, who wish to marry, might be enabled to meet women. who are willing to unite for love and companionship.

"Side by side with the parasitic woman," writes Olive Schreiner, "seeking only increased pleasure and luxury from her relations with man, stands the male

seeking only pleasure and self-indulgence from his relations with her."

Undoubtedly the waning of female parasitism will change popular ideals of love and marriage to an extent only foreshadowed at present. If men of restricted means could assure themselves that their future wives would be able to contribute to the cost of living and the maintenance of the family, they would be less frequently deterred from marriage. Of course, the serious question of maternity enters into this aspect of woman and labour. It is often asked: "How can a woman work outside of the home while she is bearing a family and tending young children?"

We have noted the hygienic necessity for periods of rest during pregnancy. Such repose could be devised in the case of the woman teacher, clerk, or artisan, as it is in the case of the actress or singer. Mrs Gilman advocates the establishment of control kitchens, well equipped with trained and fairly paid cooks, in blocks of flats, and in groups of suburban houses. This "organisation of household industries" would liberate a number of women for marriage and its duties, lessen the pecuniary burden of married life for men, provide the needed rest for expectant mothers, and afford time for family affairs that the working woman is often forced to neglect under the present system of housekeeping. Proposed reform in domestic economy must be dealt with when we come to the discussion of The Social Remedy.

We are considering for the present the case of the Wife versus the Fine Lady. Do women desire conjugality, with opportunity for extraneous occupation, the reproduction of a moderate family, compatible with health and finances, the status of equal companionship, morally and socially, with man, and the nurture and training of children in their early years; or do they yearn for a life of trivial pleasure and idleness, a kind of luxurious, respectable concubinage, absolving them from all the arduous tasks of domesticity and the tendance of offspring?

The rationally educated young woman, who values the dignity of her sex and her potential maternity, and appreciates the finer and spiritual aspect of

marriage, recoils from the mercenary ideal, and is willing to forego material luxury to attain complete womanhood. Her inclination may be termed self-interest; but it is a self-interest of a far higher order than that of the woman who chooses marriage simply as a means of easy dependent living.

The proportion of women willing to marry for love alone is larger than some of our cynics imagine. Daily observation shows that many young women, quite capable of supporting themselves in moderate comfort, gladly renounce their occupation and lose their incomes when they marry. Fortunately for humanity, there are many women who place affairs of the affections before material advantage or social distinction. To these marriage does not mean the simple gratification of a desire for an "establishment." It means that for them love is worth the price of tedious economies, deprivations, pecuniary anxieties, and the physiological penalties of parentage. These women counteract the malign power in society of the parasitic types, described by Olive Schreiner as dangerous microbes.

If women earnestly desire husbands and children, the remedy for the decline and the postponement of marriage is largely in their power. They should impress timorous bachelors that the cost of conjugal living can be kept within moderate bounds, when wives are prepared to practise self-denials, to make a science of domestic economy, and to control the finance.

The average "establishment" among the middle class, though expensive, is lacking in comfort, beauty, and hygienic essentials. Landlords levy a heavy tax on matrimony, and municipalities and councils absorb, through the rates, a large proportion of the incomes of small tradesmen, clerks, and mechanics. A mania for residing in a "good neighbourhood," engendered by snobbery, fosters the rapacity of landlords. Cliques of landowners and builders conspire to run up the value of jerry-built villas in new suburbs of the cities. The benedict seeking an abode is lured by attractive advertisements to become a tenant of an "artistic home." These houses, "with every modern convenience," are usually ill-built, with small rooms, insufficient window-space, and many other preventable

defects. The bath is a costly luxury, hardly used in some households, because of the great consumption of coal or gas necessary for heating the water. Kitchen ranges are a constant source of exasperation; some fail to "draw," and others consume a prodigious quantity of fuel before a plain dinner can be cooked. Often the chimneys smoke downwards instead of upwards, and the furniture is covered with smuts. Doors, which are often imported, and made of green-wood, warp in a few months and cannot be closed without difficulty. There are draughts in every room and passage. There are insufficient cupboards, no storage-room, and not enough shelves and pegs. Sometimes there is no coalhouse or cellar. The diminutive garden is useless for growing vegetables.

For houses of this kind the rents vary in cities from forty to eighty pounds a year. To this must be added rates, gas, and water. No wonder the unhappy wight earning say two hundred pounds per annum, the utmost he is ever likely to earn, thinks seriously before venturing into marriage. If he takes the heroic step, he may find himself with three children to maintain at the end of four years. His wife, if she is the descendant of townsfolk, is almost certain to lack nervous vigour and a healthy proportion of red corpuscles; and there is the strong probability that she will become an invalid.

Marriage might be entered at an earlier age, and with less likelihood of chronic pecuniary worry, if more houses at lower rentals were obtainable. As it is, most middle and working-class couples pay a rent out of all proportion to their incomes, especially in large towns and in certain areas. Frequently the standard is based on ideas of gentility, or class position, rather than comfort and economy. Needless furniture is often deemed essential, for no other reason than "genteel" ostentation. A cottage-piano in the "best room" is considered a symbol of prosperity. Sometimes neither the husband nor the wife can perform upon the instrument.

The fetish of the "best room," or drawing-room, is respected with fanatical ardour. In thousands of homes this apartment is not used more than a few

days in the year; but the drawing-room, with its painful upholstery, lace curtains, and unæsthetic ornaments, is considered indispensable.

The simplification of life is a difficult lesson for the ill-educated and inartistic. Everyone knows the crowded and clattered aspect of some houses of the struggling shopkeepers, or the clerks who have not learned how to buy furniture and how to dispose it. A woman of taste and ingenuity can, at a little expense, furnish and embellish a room; while a wife, lacking these virtues, will make a room comfortless and ugly, in spite of twice the expenditure. This art of taste and economy in furnishing should be a part of every girl's course of domestic training.

The common, lamentable ignorance of all classes concerning the nutritive value of various foods, and the alimental needs of the human body, leads to much waste, and often to mal-nutrition. Meat is one of the dearest forms of food, and by no means the most nourishing. This has been shown repeatedly in dietetic tables, based on the most careful analysis and experiment. A diet mostly of meat does not ensure complete and healthful nutrition. There are many foods that contain a much greater percentage of waste-repairing and tissue-making constituents than flesh. The cooking of food in the average home is as faulty as its selection. There is daily waste of material through ignorance of the first principles of culinary science.

There are housewives who, to the end of their lives, never acquire a practical knowledge of plain cookery. "Each mother," says Mrs Gilman, "slowly acquires some knowledge of her business by practising it upon the lives and health of her family, and by observing its effect on the survivors; and each daughter begins again as ignorant as her mother was before her." Possibly with the steady urbanisation of England, the dream of co-operative kitchens, controlled by well-trained cooks, may reach realisation.

Rational living, in regard to eating and drinking, can only come when less valuable time and activity are employed in the unceasing round of preparing and serving meals. A great proportion of well-to-do people are over-nourished, while a mass of the population are

habitually underfed. Many of the diseases of the rich are due to gluttony. Many of the maladies of the poor are the result of mal-nutrition and hunger.

It would seem that many fairly prosperous persons prefer the pleasures of the table to the felicities of conjugal life. The anticipation of a plain diet and economy in eating doubtless deters both men and women of the abnormal alimentative type from marrying upon a small income.

"Hundreds of women remain single in our distorted civilisation because they have never been asked at all. Thousands remain spinsters because the offers they have received threatened to expose them to privations and sacrifices which they shrank from, even more than from celibacy."[1] The essayist I have quoted believed that men are very apt to overstate the yearning of women for luxuries; and that the reluctance to marry is not caused by a love of idleness, but by revolt against a life of incessant domestic drudgery. To lessen this drudgery by every available and devisable means should be one of the chief aims of a new order of society.

"As soon as the ideas of both sexes in the middle and upper ranks," says W. R. Greg, "on the question of the income and the articles which refinement and elegance require are rectified—as soon, that is, as these exigencies are reduced from what is purely factitious to what is indisputably real—thousands who now condemn themselves and those they love to single life, will find that they can marry without foregoing any luxury or comfort which is essential to ladylike and cultivated and enjoyable existence."

William Cobbett, in his didactic "Advice to Young Men," has some shrewd observations on the choice of a wife. He gravely warns his readers that "reason, and brooches, and bracelets do not go in company"; that "accomplishments" often accompany a total ignorance of cookery, and counsels the selection of an industrious helpmate. But all men do not seek merely domestic industry and zeal in their wives. Many desire companionship; a sharing of tastes and interests, rather

[1] "Why are Women Redundant?" in "Literary and Social Judgments" W. R. Greg.

than two hot meals a day and a rigid orderliness in every room in the house. A man can enjoy these things without getting married, and often at less cost.

Cobbett remarks truly, that marriage is "a spur to exertion" in men: "many a dull sluggard has become, if not a bright man, at least a bustling man, when roused to exertion by his love . . . a fourth part of the labours I have performed never would have been performed *if I had not been a married man.*"

When there is reasonable anticipation of marriage before thirty, a young man is healthily stimulated to industry, sober-living and prudence. When life holds no promise of marriage, or its vague postponement, men grow listless, thriftless, and often prodigal. The possibility of realisation of marital happiness is, therefore, an incentive to the cultivation of faculties, patient striving, and a regular life. Social discouragement to wedlock results among men in inefficiency, self-indulgence, and irregular living. It dooms hosts of women to enforced loneliness, and the deprivation of a natural and social right, and drives thousands into prostitution.

It is strange that a community, conspicuous in many ways for humanity, and possessing a fairly developed social sense, can regard with apathy the phenomenon of compulsory female celibacy. There are women of fine character, splendid potentialities, and a deep capacity for affection, who are hopelessly condemned to a single life. Their state is not simply the outcome of a disproportion in the number of men and women in the nation. It is the result of many factors. In the national supply of food there is organisation; in love there is scarcely any social organisation. A human creature hungering for food arouses the compassion of Samaritans. Yet our Samaritans are supine in the spectacle of a multitude of men, and a greater multitude of women, hungering for love.

In the economic system we find the contrasts of inflated wealth and miserable penury. In the domain of sex we should recognise sexual satiety and sexual starvation as twin foes to public well-being. Polygyny, with its excesses, provides liberally for the dissolute pseudo-celibate man, while it bars a number of

chaste women from marriage. A more vicious circle would be hard to imagine. There is no parallel example of this inequality among animals, or in primitive tribes. It is the unique problem of "high civilisation." It is a phenomenon and a paradox of "progress," falsely so-called.

Some speak glibly of "God-given instincts," and beatify maternal yearning and love. What heed do we give to the common fulfilment of this yearning? The mass of involuntary celibate women are inarticulate. We teach that it is unwomanly to reveal a desire for love and children. Many are afraid to use the word "passion," and to voice a desire for children. The loveliest emotion of life, the greatest moral dynamic, may not be alluded to in plain, honest speech. Women are forced into hypocrisy in this matter; they dare not unburden their souls.

The great European war will probably force home the truth that late marriage and celibacy are social evils. In the Press there has been, from the outset of the war, a propaganda of marriage, with solemn forebodings on our national fate if the birth-rate is not increased as a corrective of the great losses of men in the field. Writing of the future of marriage, a journalist says that after the war society will "be faced with an enormous population of working women, and the probable reduction in the earning power of men. Consequently, marriage will assume a new aspect. Men and women will enter into a new partnership. Wives especially, accustomed to handling their own income, will desire to augment their husbands' earnings." [1]

The commonest reason given by men for refraining from marriage is want of necessary means. Economic hindrances must be examined in another chapter. This question of pecuniary disability may perhaps appear somewhat less formidable if it is considered rationally and with courage.

The following passage states the familiar problem: "As the mother of five grown-up sons, I admit it is the source of earnest regret to me that only one is

[1] "Marriage and Business Partnership," Cecil Chisholm, *Pall Mall Gazette*, Sept. 6th, 1915.

married, and largely for economic reasons the remaining four are leading bachelor lives—lives inimical to all the finer ideals of our sex. Yet, as conditions are, I do not know that I have any right to censure them. I have often talked to them about marriage, and always I have received the same answer: 'I cannot afford it.' I will not pretend that I am satisfied. I am not. It grieves me profoundly to think of my boys divorced from love and care of home and family, thus contributing to the disjointed morality of our modern civilisation. Yet I cannot see how they can well help it. And there are thousands in similar case. I say emphatically, if this is the higher civilisation, it is a sorry affair." [1]

[1] See "Women and Morality," an article in *The English Review*.

CHAPTER VIII

TYPES OF MODERN CELIBATES

Celibacy, permanent or prolonged, is enforced upon men and women in all classes through economic necessity and the nature of employment. Any form of labour that involves frequent change of abode retards marriage, and sometimes precludes it entirely. This is shown by the high proportion of celibates among navvies. The occupation of the navvy compels him to pass months, or even years, in different parts of the country. If he settles in Liverpool his work may take him to the west of Ireland, or to Land's End; and he must either break up the home, or take his wife and family with him. In many cases the lodging accommodation for navvies, in the vicinity of new reservoirs, railroads, or drainage works, is very limited, and there is not sufficient housing room for the labourers themselves. Frequently the men live in huts, and occasionally in tents. This segregation leads to irregular living and excess in drinking.

The steady urbanisation of whole country-sides is a cause of celibacy. Agricultural labourers, when they are paid a moderately fair wage, usually marry early; but the exodus to the towns often depletes a district of the younger men while the women remain on the soil. The young women grow discontented with the sparseness of opportunity for marriage, and they, in their turn, flock into the towns, and still further reduce the rural population.

Town life fosters celibacy in all classes of workers, except the unskilled and casual toilers of the slums, whose imprudence is a sign of despair. In the cities the workman may earn more money, but the cost of

living is higher than in the country, and the general standard of comfort is heightened. There is more "keeping up appearances," more inducements to spend on superfluities and amusements, and more temptations to drink. Towns are honeycombed with public-houses, and the tavern is often more cheerful and pleasant than the home. The life of pseudo-celibacy is also made easier in the cities. Commercialised "love" provides for even the poorest labourer in many towns, and offers a dangerous substitute for marriage; whereas in the rural parishes wedlock is often the only possible course for a young man.

Disinclination to settle down and marry grows among born town-dwellers and immigrants from the country. Rents are grossly disproportionate to wages in urban centres. There are no gardens to the tenements. A thrifty field-labourer is able to raise his own potatoes and other vegetables, and he can keep fowls, and sometimes a pig. In the country firewood can often be obtained for the gathering. These aids to domestic economy are lacking in towns, and their lack is scarcely compensated by the advance in wages. In town a man must wear costlier clothes than in the country.

Loneliness and the monotony of labour often urge the peasant to marry. When he becomes urbanised, the distractions, excitements, and convivial life reconcile him to bachelorhood. He is also deterred from marriage by the town girl's higher requirements in the way of dress and finery, to which she has been accustomed, and without which she would sink in her own social scale.

One obstacle to rural marriage, especially notable in Scotland, is set up by the custom of "living-in." The farm-hand has no home of his own, and no chance of obtaining one. He is in the same position as the female domestic servant. This system is one of the chief causes of widespread illegitimacy in the country parts of Scotland.

Soldiers, by the nature of their profession and by regulations, are for the great majority involuntary celibates. Very few wives are allowed "on the strength," and the soldier who marries "off the strength" has to contend with grievous disabilities.

The problem of a celibate army and navy involves well-known social results.[1] Sailors in the navy and the mercantile service comprise a large number of celibates by compulsion. The bachelor army of shop assistants is very great. Celibacy among this class is due to the injurious practice of living-in, and to inadequate salaries. Many shop assistants delay marriage till such time as they are in a position to trade for themselves, and comparatively few ever become their own masters. Badly paid women assistants in business are often forced to supplement their poor earnings by the last resort of sweated womanhood. The reports of committees of investigation and of rescue societies, and the inquiries of writers upon the condition of wage-earners, prove absolutely that many underpaid female shop assistants follow this supplementary profession.

"Morals fluctuate with trade," writes Arthur Sherwell, a careful sociological inquirer.[2] In France, Germany, America and Japan, the economic need stands highest as the determinant of prostitution. In London the ranks of this profession are recruited chiefly by domestic servants, laundresses, and dressmakers. In America, Italy, Spain, and Sweden there is a large proportion of dressmakers in this traffic.

"One who has not beheld the struggle or come in personal contact with the tempted soul of the underpaid girl, can never realise what the poverty of the city means to her."[3] Eight dollars is the smallest minimum wage upon which a single girl can keep body and soul together in Chicago. The Vice-Commissioners of Chicago report that "six dollars a week is the average in mercantile establishments." The average earnings of women in the immoral houses of the city is twenty-five dollars. "The manager of one of our big department stores feels justified in paying a high-school girl, who has served nearly one year as an inspector of sales,

[1] Professor Mathieu, in France, issued statistics proving that ninety-five in one thousand soldiers were infected with venereal diseases between the years 1862 and 1869. In 1875, through the encouragement of marriage among young soldiers, the proportion had fallen to seventy-five, and in 1878 to sixty.

[2] "Life in West London," 1897.

[3] "The Social Evil in Chicago."

the beggarly wage of four dollars per week."[1] The sweating of the women shop assistants, seamstresses, and dressmakers stimulates vice, and makes pseudo-celibacy easy and attractive to men.

Modern industrialism has caused an enormous increase in the number of clerks. This occupation is poorly paid; the impecuniosity of its members is proverbial, but it attracts a host of men, and an increasing number of women of the middle and lower classes. Some of the tenement-dwellers in York, according to Mr Rowntree's inquiry, are employed as clerks. The calling is one of the blind-alley order. It offers very few prospects of comfortable competence in old age. With good fortune a clerk may secure a bare income; but he can make only the slenderest provision against illness and for the assistance of his family after his death. If he marries before thirty, he lives in perpetual strain and anxiety. After forty he may be dismissed from employment, and unless he possesses a specialised aptitude in some branch of his profession, that is not highly overcrowded, he may find himself supplanted by younger men.

Bank clerks are often condemned to celibacy in early manhood through the regulation of their employers. The middle-aged mercantile clerk is often a celibate by compulsion. The precarious nature of this employment is intensified by the competition of young women in ever-increasing numbers.

Industrial centres swarm with bachelors and spinsters, who, for the greater number, are compelled to prolong celibacy, or to forego marriage altogether. The single woman hesitates when she reflects that marriage will mean a loss of her economic independence, and a life of increasing household drudgery, added to the pains and risks of maternity. She suppresses her natural yearning for love, a home, and children, often at the cost of psychic and physical injury. The bachelor seeks consolation in the ordinary practice of pseudo-celibates, develops confirmed bachelor habits, and frequently damages his health through dissipation.

[1] "The Social Evil in Chicago," p. 43.

Dr P. Garnier, in a lengthy study of this problem,[1] includes deaf-mutism, ugliness of countenance, and incurable disease as causes of irremediable celibacy. Undoubtedly the diseases that inhibit marriage are largely the direct and indirect consequences of celibacy. Venereal affections are often a bar to wedlock, and the source of infertility, or actual sterility, in both sexes. The physiological and medical aspects of celibacy must be considered in another chapter.

Involuntary celibacy in the professional class is very prevalent in modern society. This is due to the intensification of competition in all the professions, and the heightening of the cost of living. The average income of the doctors of the United Kingdom has been estimated at two hundred pounds per annum. Many highly capable, hardworking young physicians and surgeons, who are among the most useful members of the community, cannot afford to marry. In some medical institutions the doctors are forced by regulation to remain bachelors.

Architects, analytical chemists, and teachers of all kinds find the struggle for life grows ever keener. The teaching profession is deplorably ill-rewarded, except in a very few instances of fortunate principals. Thinkers, scholars, and scientific investigators, whose labour and research are indispensable for the well-being of society, the refinement of morals, and racial progress, are often scarcely able to obtain a decent share of the necessaries of life.

These inequalities that constantly thwart the fulfilment of manhood and womanhood in many of the finest types of the community, co-exist with a high status of commercial prosperity, and the possession of unlimited wealth by many. "Observation shows," says Dr Garnier, "the diminution of marriage and of the population, when a State sinks to its ruin through a bad government, or an excessive inequality of fortune. On the contrary, the population has an enviable vigour in the well-governed countries, where the property is sufficiently divided for the great majority of the inhabitants to possess the means to marry, to set up an establishment, and to live with their family. . . .

[1] "*Célibat et Célibataires chez les Deux Sexes.*"

TYPES OF MODERN CELIBATES

Celibacy makes frightful progress among people reduced to a precarious condition when the wealth or the power are very disproportionately divided. Eroticism and the capacity for affection then take a clandestine form, the number of abortions and of infanticides increases with the number of foundlings, evident signs of the depravation of morals."

The true celibates among men form probably a rather larger proportion than some moralists would lead us to believe. From the impartial evidence of those in a position to judge, we may estimate the sexual immorality of monastic life and the sacerdotal orders as less prevalent than Protestant opponent of Roman Catholicism suppose. In the past, as we learn from both orthodox and heterodox sources, there have been many instances of clerical licence in this respect; but it is unjust and unreasonable to posit furtive incontinence as the invariable corollary of pious celibacy.

Positive permanent chastity, a complete abstinence excluding all normal or abnormal forms of appeasing desire, is considered by many medical investigators to be extremely rare. Auto-eroticism has numberless manifestations. Some authorities assert that chastity, in its absolute literal sense, does not exist at all. But a complete abstention, lasting for a lifetime, is not impossible in some cases; and we must guard against cynical ascription of hypocrisy to those who avow personal chastity. It is probable that more men are strictly contained than the unreflective and unobservant imagine.

Among the real celibates we shall find (1) men who from moral or religious conviction practise constant suppression; (2) the subjects of congenital anæsthesia; (3) those who dread the risks of licence.

When we come to inquire into the much commoner state of spurious male celibacy, we shall find several types. The insensate libertine is perhaps the least common type. There are the roué of utterly abandoned practice, and the Lotharios or Don Juans, with the vestige of a conscience and a certain standard of ethics in their immorality. There are pseudo-celibates who refrain from the seduction of young girls, but have no scruples against intrigues with married women. There are men who abstain from adulterous amours, but

resort to courtesans. False celibacy has various grades. Some unmarried men are habitually incontinent; others control themselves periodically. Such licence and promiscuity are easier than marriage. They are the line of least resistance for a multitude of celibate men.

True celibates among women are more numerous than among men. Various reasons are advanced for the more constant chastity of women. The alleged comparative erotic insensibility of woman is often brought forward as one of the chief causes. A higher evolution of love and sex, superior modesty, timidity, religious principles, and social conventions are cited as inhibiting influences. There are, however, an increasing number of women who live in clandestine pseudo-celibacy. Certain occupations and professions tend to break down the barriers of womanly restraint and social prudence. Free Love is the new gospel of a fairly large proportion of young women in many of the European countries. Woman's entrance into the industrial and commercial fields has, to a large extent, revolutionised her moral standards. It would be remarkable if the winning of a measure of independence, the dissolution of the old ideal of a sheltered domestic life, and freer social intercourse were without evidences of a somewhat vehement reaction against the restraints of the past.

Typical celibate women, approaching the neuter order, are becoming more common in the middle and better-educated classes. Some are zealously devoted to art, and a few to science. Many take religious vows of celibacy. A large number enter the teaching profession.

There are many valid reasons why the education of the young should be the task of married women. The woman who has known love and experienced parentage is naturally more competent in the understanding of life, more sympathetic towards childhood, and in all respects better equipped for tuition than the average single woman. Many of the false views of life, the oblique and distorted conceptions of love, and the intellectual insincerities of women may be traced to the influence of ill-educated spinster teachers.

TYPES OF MODERN CELIBATES

The repressed life of the celibate school-mistress is an instance of the general effect of enforced celibacy upon women. A whole sphere of thought and a wealth of emotion are undiscovered and unknown. The intellectual inferiority of a mass of women is attributable to the severe restriction of thought concerning the most vital of matters. These restraints and repressions induce a mental timidity that colours every speculation. They cause a dread of thought itself.

As I have more women friends in the scholastic than in other avocations, I am not wanting in admiration for teachers. The potentiality of the pedagogue is enormous, but that potentiality has never been developed to the full as a moral and intellectual force. Women teachers are hardly worked and illiberally rewarded for their high service. They have specific difficulties, trials, and bodily and nervous maladies. Upon many celibacy is compulsory. A considerable number die unmarried. They pass the greater part of their lives in a feminine community, segregated, and debarred from frequent intellectual association with the opposite sex. As a result many, though learned in the academic sense, are lamentably wanting in broad knowledge and understanding.

It is questionable whether society is wise in placing the voluntary, perpetual celibate woman in positions of authority and responsibility demanding a sympathetic knowledge of human nature, its passions, and its foibles. The quality commonly known as " superiority " afflicts many of these women. In organic structure, the cast of their minds, and the trend of their feelings, they exhibit hardness and censoriousness, and are prone to tyrannise and domineer. Love, conjugality, and maternity, with their deep emotions, their felicities, pains, and disciplines, are beyond the limited boundary of their experience. A species of psychic sclerosis may be diagnosed in these cases.

CHAPTER IX

CELIBACY AS A VOLUNTARY IDEAL

RENUNCIATION of marriage, as a means of preserving personal sanctity and purity, grew from a theological ideal in the early days of Christianity. There is no evidence that Jesus Christ directly counselled celibacy to his followers. St Paul is usually quoted by the exponents of religious celibacy as the authority in this matter. It is certain that the apostle's attitude towards wedlock profoundly influenced the teaching of the Fathers of the Church.

St Jerome declared that Heaven would punish the married. It was penal to preach that a husband might attain divine pardon. St Anthony led an order of ascetics vowed to abstinence from marriage. Leo I. commanded celibacy among the clergy. Later, Peter Damiani announced the corruption of the sacerdotal orders through the system of compulsory continence, and presented his report to Leo IX.

Monastic celibacy was introduced about the third or fourth century of the Christian era, but according to Neander, Mosheim and other historians, the practice was not widespread till the eleventh century. The first convent is said to have been controlled by St Synclitica. Men and women withdrew from the temptations of the world, and segregated themselves in ascetic communities. St Augustine was opposed to celibacy, and so was the devout Erasmus.

Many sincere and noble characters were among those who took vows of chastity; but many lapsed from continence, and for a long period the irregularities of conventual life were the subject of hierarchic inquiry.[1]

[1] Lea's "History of Sacerdotal Celibacy," based upon orthodox data, contains ample evidence of the licence of the clergy in the Middle Ages.

The mendicant friars were self-denying zealots, with high aspirations and a real sympathy for the poor. Under St Francis of Assisi there arose a socialistic fraternity, pledged to purity of life and charitable actions; but when Monasticism became secularised and the monasteries wealthy, through endowments and legacies, the finer virtues of the orders were less apparent.

Dr P. Garnier, in an examination of "Religious Celibacy," reprehends the system as anti-natural, unsocial, and contrary to the doctrine of Jesus. This may be said to represent the Protestant view of absolute continence at the time of the Reformation. Luther and Calvin ranked marriage more as an affair of the State than as a religious sacrament. Notwithstanding, marriages were still solemnised in places of worship.

If we can accept Milton as a representative of Puritan thought in his day, we are bound to admit that the reforming spirit was opposed to the laudation of celibacy. Milton was an ardent advocate of wedlock, and a pioneer in the reform of the divorce law. There was, however, a powerful Puritanic recoil against sex love in both its licit and illicit forms. In Scotland, in the seventeenth century, it was considered sinful to desire to have children. Some of the clergy forbade husbands from kissing their wives on the Sabbath day. The Presbytery of Glasgow issued an order that there should be no music at wedding parties, no dancing, and no gaiety. Humanity was deemed unclean even before birth. The natural instincts were considered abominable. Washing the body was forbidden on Sundays. Kirk Session punished irregular sexual intimacies with flogging, ducking "in the deepest and foulest pool of water in the town or parish," and banishment from the town for ever. Public chastisement for illicit relations was common.

The penalties for extra-marital intercourse were scarcely more severe than the penalties for showing affection in family life. Even legitimate love was penalised by the inhibitions, denunciations, and corrections of the fanatical Kirk. The most beautiful instincts and emotions were associated with impurity. There was no fine ideal of chastity, no moral valuation

of ascetic practice; the self-denials were mere means of escaping the wrath of Heaven. The sex-passion was hunted into dark, unwholesome corners, where it grew morbid and vicious.

At the root of voluntary celibacy there is usually sexphobia in a greater or less degree of intensity. This awe is, to a certain extent, a natural feeling arising from the massive power and the mystery of the attraction of the sexes. It is evident among some primitive people, and has no basic relation to religion. The tremendous sway of sex alarmed devout souls in the earlier faiths, because it warred against a total suppression of all desires that lured from pious contemplation and sacred ecstasy. Sex-love was to the devotee a lust that contended perpetually against complete preoccupation with the divine.

When the Church was confronted with the problem of the cessation of the human race, through a universal practice of celibacy, the canonical wisdom decided that celibacy could never become general, because such a state would involve the end of mankind. There was never any real attempt to impose celibacy on all, although it is stated that the Council of Trent anathematised marriage.[1] It is incredible that shrewd ecclesiastics were ever wholly united in any proposal to forbid matrimony for the mass of the people. Celibacy was extolled as the noblest spiritual living, and gradually enforced upon the clerical orders; while a considerable measure of liberty of conscience in this matter was permitted to the laity. There was naturally no other course for the canonists. Wedlock was therefore appropriated by the Church, controlled, regulated, and commended. A sacred import was attached to the very institution that the more fanatical clerics had denounced as inimical to the holiest mode of life. Marriage was exalted as a mystic symbol of Christ's union with His Bride, the Church. It was quite clear that St Paul, in spite of his personal prefer-

[1] "We cannot but notice even in the greatest of the Christian fathers a lamentably low estimate of woman, and consequently of the marriage relationship," Smith's "Dictionary of Christian Antiquities." Lecky states that the Fathers regarded woman "as the door of hell, the mother of all human ills."

ence for celibacy, had not interdicted matrimony among his followers.

Notwithstanding the approval of marriage, and the sanction of sexual love after priestly consecration, there still remained the ideal of celibacy. The association of a deficient zeal for piety with the inclination to obey the impulse of love, even in its canonised form, still lingered in the minds of men and women. This view undoubtedly survived till the Protestant Reformation, and some traces of the ascetic feeling may be noted to this day among our compatriots. Luther encouraged marriage, and his example was followed by his successors among the leaders of Protestantism.

The cultured Erasmus of Rotterdam had no sympathy with the fetish of celibacy. This is shown in his "Twenty-two Select Colloquies," which bear evidence that his thought, especially in regard to marriage and the position of women, was far in advance of his age. In the dialogue between "The Abbot and the Learned Woman," Erasmus writes with what would be called in our day "a marked feminist bias."

ANTRONIUS, THE ABBOT, addressing Magdalia, his hostess, says: "You talk like a Philosopher in a Petticoat, methinks."

MAGDALIA: "And you, methinks, like something that's far from it. But what's your quarrel all this while to the furniture of this House?"

ANTRONIUS: "A spinning-wheel, or some Instrument for Good Huswifery were more suitable for your Sex."

MAGDALIA: "Is it not the Duty then of a Housekeeper to keep her Family in Order, and look to the Education of Her Children?"

ANTRONIUS: "'Tis so."

MAGDALIA: "And is this Office to be discharged without Understanding?"

ANTRONIUS: "I suppose not."

MAGDALIA: "This Understanding do I gather from my Books."

The Abbot continues to declaim against wisdom in women, until Magdalia exclaims: "But 'tis not yet so rare a thing neither, as you Imagine, to find Learned

Women, for I could give you out of Spain, Italy, England, Germany, etc., so many Eminent Instances of our Sex, as if you do not mend your Manners, may come to take Possession of your very Schools, your Pulpits, and your Mitres. . . . If you go on at the rate you begin the People will sooner endure Preaching Geese than Dumb Pastors."

In "The Colloquy of the Marriage Hater," a girl who has "a phansie to a cloyster" consults a friend, Eubulus, who counsels her to marry instead. The maiden Catharina goes to a convent, but in twelve days escapes and comes to tell Eubulus that she has repented of her vow.

It is instructive that, with the waning of pious ascetic idealism at the Reformation, and the sanctification of the married state, there still survived a curious half-shameful view of the natural physical expression of conjugal love. This attitude is still manifest, though education and saner thought have lessened its prevalence. It is shown in the lingering opposition to the teaching of sex-knowledge to the young, and even to adults; in the prudery that masquerades as purity of thought; and in the furtive jesting about sex that is common in all classes of the community from the highest to the lowest.

Sexphobia is an aberration, or an intense and abnormal accentuation, of the natural sexual reserve common among primitive people, and normal among the civilised races. Clement of Alexandria and other ancient teachers and philosophers condemned as immodest many of the ordinary and indispensable acts of life. Even important functions are veiled to this day in the strictest secrecy between mothers and their marriageable daughters. Dr Helen Kennedy, referring to this injurious reticence in America, says that less than half of the girls in a high school "felt free to talk with their mothers on this most important matter." Many of the pupils in this school "passed into womanhood with no knowledge whatever, from a proper source, of all that makes them women." Tilt, the distinguished gynæcologist, after inquiry among a thousand women, found that 25 per cent were entirely ignorant at the onset of the monthly phenomenon.

Abundant examples could be given of the abnormal fear of sex. Such examples are all around us in our daily life. The phobia is an outcome of juvenile impressions, and in extreme cases it is never overcome or modified by reflection and reason. Sometimes this aberration is the cause of voluntary perpetual celibacy. Frequently it accounts for psychic sexual anæsthesia. It is often mistaken for modesty; but real modesty is a grace, a restraint, and not a morbid dread of natural impulse. Delicacy, refinement, purity and modesty must not be confused with neurasthenic symptoms. They are the virtues of the balanced, the sane, and the normal, not of the morally and mentally asthenic and ailing.

I am not affirming that all voluntary celibacy is motived by a recoil against love and sex. The true moral type of ascetic is one who, while capable of experiencing powerful craving, resolves to curb or conquer desire as a sanative discipline, or as a means of attaining spiritual perception and exaltation.[1] Undoubtedly periods of ascetic living bear fruit in virtue, experience, and the awakening of psychic faculties. The voluntary renunciation of pleasure for a specific and worthy purpose is a sign of strength and of zeal in endeavour. Such self-denial is compatible with a broad sympathy towards others who legitimately gratify their desires. It is a personal ideal, not a code for universal application. The real ascetic is a being of strong passions, who is strong in controlling those passions to definite ends apart from their main trend. There is no doubt that the genesic impulse can be diverted by self-imposed discipline into channels of philanthropy, humanism, and social reform. In like manner, many great works of art and splendid researches in science have resulted from the diversion of sex-force into creative labour and intellectual absorption. Men and women of the finest types have foregone love for works of piety, the service of man-

[1] " He that is chast and continent not to impair his strength or honest for fear of contagion, will hardly be heroically virtuous . . . But be chast in thy flaming days, when Alexander dar'd not trust his eyes upon the fair sisters of Darius, and when so many think there is no other way but Origen's.—" Religio Medici," Sir Thomas Browne.

kind, and for worthy study. No mere fetish-worship of a selfish ideal, but real devotion, has been the actuating energy in these instances. Out of solitude and renunciation noble thought has been born in all ages.

There is no justification for a thoughtless, unqualified condemnation of celibacy as a personal ideal and predilection. Celibacy may be noble, and wedlock may be, and often is, a pitifully ignoble state of life. No one will dispute that a St Francis of Assisi is a beautiful example of pious celibacy. It may be well to repeat that voluntary celibacy is often admirable, and that involuntary, enforced celibacy is an evil.

Celibacy by choice among men may be the outcome of ascetic idealism, a stoical renunciation of domestic happiness for the attainment of virtue, or the cultivation of mental faculties. These incentives are, however, rare in the male sex. The restraints on marriage among men are often self-imposed for no other reason than economic prudence. Very frequently the voluntarily single man is an egoist, whose self-regarding impulses determine his celibacy. He does not wish to forego certain gratifications for the securing of pleasure that he values less than these. If he belongs to the upper social order, he may refrain from marriage because as the provider for a family he would not be able to afford to keep a couple of hunters.

The love of luxury and the irresponsibility of the bachelor life bias many men against the economic restrictions and the parental and social obligations of matrimony. In these types sensuality may be strong, but sentiment and conjugal instinct are weak.

A few bachelors are misogynists. Some do not hate women, but profess misogamy. Others are wanting in paternal affection and do not wish to burden themselves with children. A proportion of perpetual celibate men are nomadic and restless by nature; they are born to wander, and they chafe at the notion of a fixed abode and a regular domestic existence. A fairly large and probably increasing number are sexually inverted. Social history bears evidence that this abnormality grows in communities when the popularity of marriage begins to wane. The perverted of all

classes often refrain instinctively from monogamic sex-relationships.

An intensity of social instinct deters some men from marriage. They are not content unless in the company of their own sex. Examples of this class are to be found in every club. They are often great talkers, who require an audience; they delight in telling humorous stories, and in repartee, gossip, and tattle. Many are incurably convivial. They are depressed when alone, and find constant excitement and distraction in the smoking-room and the bar. A considerable number spend all their spare time in drinking in company; and they usually become hard drinkers, pseudo-alcoholics, or pathological inebriates.

Alcohol is a potent enemy of love and marriage. Bacchus entices a very large number of men from the society of women. There is quite a large class of men that rarely associate with the other sex. They know nothing whatever about women, and are often half-afraid of them. Some of these habitual carousers are over-male in organisation; they lack the touch of feminine fastidiousness and refinement that enters into the composition of a more harmonious masculine type. They are often conscious of their clumsy, maladroit, brusque manners, which make them feel ill at ease in the company of women. Their constant tippling coarsens brain-tissue, dulls sensibility, and ultimately injures reproductive vigour. Vicious intemperance in drink often leads to looseness in sex-morality; while pathological topers often develop an aversion to the opposite sex.

The amount expended by some men upon whisky-and-soda would keep a wife and family in comfort. I know a bachelor who spends from one to two pounds a day upon treating friends and paying for his own drinks. Conviviality has its benefits, and the use of alcohol in moderation is not to be condemned. But alcohol is one of the great poisons of civilisation. The nerve-strain and the depressing influences of urban life tend more and more to foster the craving for stimulants and narcotics. Alcohol gradually and insidiously becomes a need in tens of thousands of persons who have acquired a taste for it. To produce

the pleasant condition of well-being that the tired or worried man desires, he is compelled to take the anodyne in increasing doses. After long habituation to this practice, some organic, psychic, or moral lesions are sure to result.

The coarsening of feeling and the deadening of finer emotions, induced by indulgence in potent liquors, transforms, in a greater or less degree, the psychic being. Even a slight cirrhosis of the liver, or sclerosis of the arteries, may react upon the mind. It is well known that many of the lapses of young men from control of the sex-passion are due to the dulling of inhibitive restraint while under the influence of alcohol. One glass too much may so entirely effect a man's conduct that he appears like another person. The influence of the protracted abuse of alcohol cannot be avoided. The erstwhile genial friend becomes our exacting foe.

Alcohol in excess promotes both incontinence and morbid disinclination. In the first stage of its use, it may stimulate; but after prolonged immoderation, it enfeebles or inhibits the emotion of love. A man of normal erotic sensibility, who acquires the habit of free drinking in his early manhood, is often quite indifferent to marriage at the age of thirty-five. He has developed a passion for alcoholic narcosis, which has destroyed the natural desire for love. Many middle-aged and elderly bachelors are single from this cause.

A marked preoccupation with the pleasures of the table, or a hyperæsthesia of the gustatory sense, which is notable in many celibates, is not very infrequently a cause of abstaining from marriage. The culinary epicure fixes great attention upon eating. Sometimes the gratification of his fastidious alimentary cravings excludes other desires. We all know the man who devotes studious consideration to the menu, investing the selection of dainties with all the solemnity of a pious ritual. Cooking is a fine art, and diet is an important matter, but excessive care about the choice of food and incessant concentration of mind upon eating are symptoms of an undue interest in the palate and stomach.

A VOLUNTARY IDEAL

Deliberate preference for the single life is shown by an enormous proportion of bachelors, whose polygynous propensities are readily gratified in our chaotic society. When we speak of the "celibacy" of men, we should explain whether actual continence or pseudo-continence is implied. The bulk of unmarried men are not celibate in the strict sense of the term. Among men voluntary abstention from wedlock is not often accompanied by voluntary mortification of sexual desire. For this reason male celibacy must be regarded from a different estimate than the celibacy of women. Most single women form no sort of sex-relationship, ephemeral or permanent; and their celibacy is not merely apparent, but real. This is true both in the case of compulsory and voluntary celibate-living among women.

Self-imposed celibacy in women is adopted for some of the reasons that actuate men. These reasons are ambition to excel in a profession, zeal, piety, enthusiasm for social reform, and the love of independence. Other inhibiting factors against marital life are a dislike of men, lack of conjugal qualities, feeble maternal instinct, sexphobia, hystero-neurasthenic revulsions, distaste for ordered domestic life, a polyandrous bias, sexual perversions, anæsthesia, and physical malformations and abnormalities.

The voluntary female celibate is usually apt to show a kind of pride in her state. She would have her friends know that she is free from the sentimentalism that so often handicaps her sex in the battle of life, and impedes women in the struggle for emancipation from masculine bondage. She has frequently "a very poor opinion of men," which she delights in expressing. Her manner to men is condescending, or elaborately tolerant. Often she is a vehement critic of men and their morals. Her influence upon young women is often powerful; they recognise "force of character" in her attitude of independence, her cynical aphorisms concerning love and sentiment, and her scathing denunciation of the opposite sex. Some of these celibate sisters are the centre of an admiring coterie of women, who never fail to flatter them, to hang reverently upon their pronouncements, and to applaud their misogamy and misanthropy.

THE GREAT UNMARRIED

Voluntary celibacy in women may bear fruit in the noblest altruism, splendid philanthropy, and a diffusion of sympathy and kindliness. There are women with a natural saintliness who, for high motives, refrain from wedlock, and whose innate love flows out to humanity, to the afflicted, the helpless, and the erring. They radiate compassion, tenderness, and affection. These finest examples of feminine celibacy do not credit themselves with superiority by reason of their renunciation.

There is nothing meritorious—nothing indicative of superlative virtue—in the celibate restraints and denials of those who are congenitally incapable of a deep passion. An atrophied emotion is not essentially the proof of a long-protracted struggle against imperious yearnings. It may be the evidence of a naturally cold heart, a morbid state of mind, or physiological abnormality. The truly chaste are those who know the torture of temptation and victory over surging desires. Celibacy *per se* is not a virtue; but its self-abnegations, resistances, and conquest of impulse in many instances represent a high moral excellence. Psychopathological celibacy is outside of any ethical standards. It is simply a morbid phenomenon, and no more admirable than colour-blindness.

Celibacy through indifference, when widespread in a community, is a sign of flagging vitality. In the individual this apathy has often a true pathological basis, or it is caused by a devitalised, asthenic state, precluding the strenuous pursuit of courtship and mating. This hesitancy occasionally results in life-long celibacy. The virile, energetic man is courageous in love as in other affairs; the normal, healthy woman is ready to mate with an approved suitor. Neurasthenia in both sexes sometimes sets up a fear of marriage, or an indifference to it.[1]

Hatred of marriage or misandry is not uncommon among ardent women advocates of the complete personal independence of women. Although this recoil is often marked by exaggeration, private prejudice, and ill-considered denunciations of men, it has its reason and a certain justification. There are gross inequalities for women in the legal status of wedlock, and so long

[1] See chapter on The Results of Celibacy.

as those inequalities remain, a proportion of women will tend to misogamic repulsion. These injustices must be arraigned in another chapter.

Some of the anti-marriage enthusiasts are quite in earnest in their proposal to introduce artificial means of propagating the human species. This "remedy" would remove the necessity for marriage, but unfortunately for the consistency of the ideal, it would not entirely destroy the co-operation of the male sex. The subject is, however, gravely discussed by certain advanced female emancipators of the man-contemning order.

The phobia, or dislike, of matrimony is not always simulated by women who elect to remain single. Such fear may be observed in the congenitally frigid, a more numerous class among the women of old and decadent civilisations than we are wont to admit. Some inquirers doubt whether positive anæsthesia exists. There is no question, however, that psychic repugnances to love, marriage, and child-bearing are somewhat common among English women. Most of the women of the Latin and Southern races ascribe coldness to their sisters in Great Britain. Even in France, where there is a profound idealisation of love, there is said to be "a legion of the eternally frigid." [1]

This manifestation has been discussed at length by Havelock Ellis, who is inclined to the view that real anæsthesia is rare. The neurotic or neuropathic forms of coldness are sufficiently common to warrant the opinion that conviction of an absence of natural ardour deters a fair number of women from conjugality. I have devoted inquiry to this problem during twenty-five years, and collected the testimony of many women professing frigidity. Most of my informants are educated; some are highly cultured. A careful analysis shows that admission of coldness and indifference must always be accepted with great reserve. Many women who fancy that they are singled out by Nature for a celibate existence, fall in love, marry, bear children, and find happiness in conjugal and parental life.

Atony is perhaps the commonest cause of disinclina-

[1] "Humanisme Intégral," Léopold Lacour. Bebel notes the phenomenon in Germany, and Lombroso in Italy.

tion for marriage. The neglect of female hygiene stimulates many kinds of morbid physical processes, that react on the mind and the emotions, often to a profound degree. Very few persons of either sex are rational in eating and drinking, and the bulk of women suffer from injudicious dietetic habits. Even in the upper classes many women are underfed and ill-nourished. Loss of appetite and gustatory apathy are fairly prevalent among women in all the social strata. Our artificial mode of living highly favours the two extremes of overfeeding and underfeeding. The balance of health and the state of eupepsy are not kept up by the quantity of food consumed. Some of the common articles of diet have only an infinitesimal nutritive value, and some have none at all.

Atonic and anæmic manifestations are often the concomitants of feminine antipathy to marriage and fear of reproduction. The states foster anæsthesia in a marked degree, and induce organic and functional disorder. Woman's naturally light blood tends to become thinner through unhygienic diet and general neglect of health. Even the daughters of wealthy families develop anæmia and chlorosis. The affectability of women is enhanced greatly by anæmia, and the complaint has its emotional symptoms and reactions.

The sinking of the specific gravity of the blood in female adolescence and early womanhood favours anæmia and the chlorotic tendency, as pointed out by Dr E. Lloyd Jones, an authority on chlorosis. As an instance of the ignorance of women concerning their bodies, it should be noted that some modern physicians have traced one of the causes of chlorosis to the chronic constipation so frequent among young women. This preventable disorder proves the source of innumerable evils.

It is safe to assert that ill-health and debility in women often set up mental and emotional recoils against love, and that in some cases this is the reason for voluntary celibacy. The normally healthy human being is responsive to the instincts implanted by Nature, and the normally sane brain accepts impulse rationally. Moral education and the social instinct combine to control and regulate the primary physical impulse.

A disordered condition of the nerves results in disordered thinking, unreasoning prejudice and aversion, abnormal repulsions and morbid fears. Confirmed celibates of both sexes are often sick people who have lost the capacity for falling in love. They may imagine that they are heroes and heroines of noble renunciation, while they are really infirm or degenerate. We cannot "renounce" that which we are incapable of desiring. A cirrhosis of the amative emotion is not a moral virtue. It is an abnormality.

Fatal early mental impressions and shocks very frequently induce psychic complexes of a grave character. Such shocks cause lesions that are extremely difficult to heal. I believe that they are common factors in the development of coldness or indifference to the love of the sexes. This is a vital reason for thorough reform in the education of the young, and the direction of immature thought into normal and wholesome channels. Almost all that we have gathered casually and haphazard, often from the impurest sources, concerning sex and love, has to be unlearned when we are confronted with reality in wedded life. The literature of neurasthenia and hysteria convinces conclusively that emotional shock produces far-reaching and even ineradicable effects. Many of the neuroses spring from a revulsion, a fear, or a deep bewilderment aroused by a few words, a sudden revelation, or an abhorrent spectacle. Psychoneurotic research abounds with extraordinary instances.

Men and women, apparently sane and normal, are often under a depressing cloud of doubt, misapprehension, or dread, of which they alone are conscious. Almost daily we may encounter, in educated persons of both sexes, the most curious complexes, brought into being by distant causes that may seem trivial, but which are, nevertheless, the source of much secret misery. The subject can only be referred to in passing. It is one that would fill a volume of synthesis alone. We are only in the outer threshold of a new science of psychology that promises great hope for the future relief of humanity.

Sexphobia, misogyny, misogamy, or misandry, anæsthesia and other morbid phenomena of effete civilisation

are all agents militating against a healthy relationship of the sexes. They are the cause of anti-social feeling and action; they deeply tinge, or positively darken, moral judgments, and limit the whole outlook on life. In their more marked forms these obsessions, aversions and repulsions are signs of insanity. In any of their guises they are abnormal. They indicate a foolish and unwholesome spirit of opposition to the most benignant and sanative decrees of Nature. The rarest raptures, the sweetest altruistic joys, the deepest sanctifications that the gods confer upon mankind, are unknown by those who refuse Love.

Probably a polyandrous bias is a cause of abstention from monogamous unions among a certain number of women. It would be more correct to use the word polygyny in this relation, because polyandry is a system of sanctioned marriage observed in several communities. The ideal of permanent cohabitation with one mate is not attractive to a number of errant men. Variety in the sexual relationship has its earnest as well as frivolous advocates in most of the Western civilisations.

This spurious form of polygamy is sometimes compared by writers to the promiscuity of the *demi-monde* and its associates. This is, however, not a happy example of the sanctified state of plural marriage permitted by Mahomet to his followers. Prostitution is the worst conceivable instance of anarchic promiscuous association of the sexes; and it is an insult to Islam to liken the traffic to legal polygamy. Even the concubinage of the upper classes in Europe and America, though on a higher level than the prostitution of the streets, is on a very different plane from religiously sanctioned polygamy.

The pseudo-polyandrous, or polygynous, Western woman is the counterpart of the variety-loving man. She is incapable of constancy, or prone to aberrations in her desires. Probably most persons of either sex—some would say all—have a latent tendency to such inconstancy in love. Religion, reason, ethical principles, social exigencies and other powerful restraints suppress this tendency. To many men and women reared in the tradition of strict indisoluble monogamy,

extra-matrimonial intimacy is unthinkable, and some would shrink from the idea as they would shrink from murder. Some women frankly recognise and admit the impulse. Among these a proportion drift into prostitution. A larger proportion form a series of liaisons, brief attachments, or " Free Love " unions of a more or less transitory character.

It is sometimes stated that the freeing of women from the old social inhibitions and severe codes is fostering feminine freedom in sex morals. Such a reaction would seem a not unlikely consequence, when we recognise that such reactions almost uniformly accompany all great changes in society. But if we are really passing through a phase of seeming licence, it should be remembered that phases of this kind are not indicative of a general break-up of the standard of sexual ethics. Among Western women the monogamic form of relationship is the most highly approved. The conservative instinct of women may be trusted to uphold and cherish the ideal of single marriage and the exclusive possession of one mate. No human system is perfect, but monogamous wedlock meets the needs of the majority; and for a number of reasons, biological, social and hygienic, it is the best marriage custom.

We have seen that the incentives and stimuli to voluntary celibacy are numerous, ranging from profound religious enthusiasm to forms of psychic apathy or atonic inhibition. One cause of rejecting conjugal life remains for inquiry. There is no doubt that a fair percentage of women deliberately choose the life of the courtesan in preference to matrimony. Statistical investigations undertaken by physicians and surgeons in hospital practice, reforming councils and societies, lay students of the problem, and ministers, show that economic necessity stands high as one of the causes of prostitution. The poverty-stricken woman, everywhere in civilisation, is in a more helpless condition than the necessitous man.

Years ago Parent Duchâtelet, a distinguished Parisian pioneer in this important research, came to the view, after diligent inquiry, that nearly all the women of this class are driven into the traffic by destitution. Sanger, in America, places poverty at the head of his list of

causes.[1] Federow, in Russia, finds the highest percentage among the destitute.

There is, however, a tendency to-day to underrate indigence as the most imposing cause of prostitution. In some tables of statistics we find that "inclination," or "vice and depravity," are given as main causes. Sanger, as a result of interrogating two thousand women of this profession, assigned five hundred and twenty-five cases to destitution, and five hundred and thirteen to inclination. A discussion of the alleged causes of the social evil, and the reasons why so many women resort to the streets, is not within the scope of this volume; but it is necessary to give some attention to the determinant "inclination," as this question bears upon voluntary abandonment of marriage by a large class of women.

Lombroso, Weiniger and other authors have maintained a theory of biological predisposition to prostitution. The Italian professor is of the opinion that some women are born courtesans, as some men are born criminals, while the German writer divides women into two great groups: natural prostitutes and natural mothers. Without accepting such broad generalisations as these, we may say fairly that many women in civilised, industrial states select this calling with full premeditation. They are, therefore, a menace to public health and morals, and indirectly the cause of voluntary pseudo-celibacy among men. The predisposition is less the sign of uncontrolled sensuality than of deep discontent with the dull monotony of the small wage-earner's existence. The yearning for excitement, colour, variety, and pleasure lure many girls from industrial occupations and the drudgery of the kitchen to the so-called "gay life." As an outcome their revolt against the restraints and privations of the working-class home reduces the number of marriages in the lower and especially in the upper classes. So long as a large class of women are ready to barter themselves out of wedlock, a large number of men find abstinence from marriage quite tolerable and easy.

[1] "History of Prostitution." See also "Sex in Relation to Society," by Havelock Ellis; "Life and Labour," Charles Booth; and "Work among the Fallen," G. P. Merrick.

The only remedy for lessening this inclination among women lies in a finer, broader education of the young in the dignity, beauty and sacredness of love and marriage, and above all, in a great awakening of conscience in the capitalist and employing class. The rich are, to a very great extent, culpable for the vices of the poor. There can be no reform in this direction until labour is emancipated, and the lot of the woman-worker ameliorated. It is necessary to reiterate that if the owners of capital require more operatives and labourers, they must accept their share in the task of facilitating the marriage of sound men and women.

The profession of the courtesan might be made undesirable by making marriage more desirable and easy. Virtue is sometimes on the line of least resistance. The practice of prostitution has very rarely been even checked by repressive measures, and there is no instance anywhere of its suppression by penal authority. A practical antidote is the popularisation of regulated conjugality. *If some of the activity applied to the attempted suppression of sexual vice were devoted to making the path of sexual virtue less difficult, great triumphs for the moralists would ensue.*

Such a method of reform has not even been suggested. We continue to pile up penalties on the sinful, but we fail to encourage the virtuous. Under our commercial ideal of life, we actually make "vice" lucrative and attractive; while virtue is penalised by sweating wages, a sordid struggle with poverty, and unremitting, monotonous labour. There is, in fact, the strongest possible temptation to the abandonment of virtue among the daughters of the poor. All the reformers, clergymen, missioners and doctors who have worked among the industrial classes, testify that the chastity of the women is preserved by the exercise of a restraint and fortitude that their sheltered sisters of the higher class are never forced to cultivate and cannot appreciate. The pharisaical condemnation of the alleged widespread immorality of the women of the poorer orders is the evidence of a profound ignorance of social conditions.

CHAPTER X

CELIBACY AS A PENALTY

In animal societies celibacy is only imposed upon the immature, the maimed, and the aged. Pairing and reproduction are never neglected at the season of breeding, or the period when physical vigour is most marked. In the interval between the recurrent seasons of propagation, the impulse is completely or almost dormant. The same law governs the reproductive instinct in some primitive human communities, and to a certain extent, the impulse in civilised mankind is controlled by seasonal changes, as shown by an increase of weddings in the spring.

The licentiousness of savages has been immensely overstated. There is the fullest testimony of travellers and investigators, notably that of Professor Westermarck and Professor Frazer, that barbarous people in general are rarely very erethic, but quite the reverse. The unchastity observed among savage tribes is very frequently the result of the corrupting influences of "civilisation." Frazer and other anthropologists have shown that continence is strictly enforced on the savage warrior, also upon the women left at home. Enforced temporary separation of the sexes is common in some primitive societies.

Among the uncultured races, celibacy is often compulsory for a period in youth: during war and hunting expeditions, and at times of religious ceremonial. It is imposed as a penalty of old age, and sometimes of physical feebleness or disorder. Among the higher races there is no social penalty attaching to the marriage of the unfit. Nature is, however, not supine in her attitude towards this infraction of biological law, and she visits the transgression ruthlessly upon the third and fourth generation. A young, healthy hen

drives away the old and enfeebled male bird. Unfortunately for the race, human beings do not exercise such wise selective judgment. From this cause man is an ailing creature, who passes on his diseases and disabilities from generation to generation.

Religion, law, and public opinion in the mass sanction the propagation of moral and physical degenerates, habitual criminals, mental defectives, dipsomaniacs, victims of drug habits, consumptives, and syphilitics. Crime, hereditary disease, insanity, alcoholism, and infant mortality are the fruits of this immoral reproduction. Society looks on unmoved. Prisons, asylums, hospitals and sanatoria increase.

Dr Pernet, a well-known specialist, said a few years ago: "There is no doubt whatever that syphilis is on the increase in London, judging from hospital work alone."[1] Dr Havelock Ellis declares: "There is no more subtle poison than that of syphilis." Lieutenant-Colonel Lambkin, a medical officer, says that this plague is "one of the chief causes of physical degeneration in England . . . it is a fact that is acknowledged on all sides."[2] General paralysis, one of the worst scourges of civilisation, is on the increase, and in 1902 a section of the British Medical Association appealed to the legislature to take measures for the lessening of syphilis, which is largely the cause of general paralysis. Nothing has been attempted in this direction.

The infection of whole tribes of subject races by white men has been recorded. In Uganda, Lambkin found that 90 per cent of the people in certain districts were afflicted, and 50 to 60 per cent of infant mortality was due to this cause.[3]

The penalties of vice, superadded to specific diseases, are sterility in both sexes, infantile blindness, premature births, ovarian disease, insanity, and paralysis, besides a host of minor ailments.

The Chicago Commissioners recommend that "no marriages should be legal unless both parties furnish certificates of health, and freedom from venereal

[1] *British Medical Journal*, March 30th, 1907.
[2] See a lengthy review of venereal diseases of to-day in "Sex in Relation to Society," 1910.
[3] *British Medical Journal*, Oct. 3rd, 1908.

diseases, given by legally qualified physicians." The penalty for these devastating diseases should be the prohibition of reproduction by the infected. The enforcing of such an order would be extremely difficult, if not universally impossible; but there is not the slightest doubt that such precaution would immensely reduce the diseases and the sufferings of society.

Prophylactic measures, which have been proposed, and partly adopted in some countries, are (1) a rational, moral and hygienic education of adolescents by means of instruction, literature, and lectures; (2) preventive methods as adopted by military authorities on the Continent; (3) medical supervision of the courtesan class, or of both sexes (as tried in Hamburg). These measures cannot be discussed here. The point of supreme importance is that the infected should be restrained from passing on the virus to posterity.

Should celibacy be enforced by law upon the incurably diseased? Must we forbid the marriage of those afflicted with the more pronounced neuroses, tuberculosis, and other devastating maladies?[1] Some scientific authorities have proposed a mode of sterilising the unfit, which would not debar marriage. Undoubtedly the perpetuation of the race is the supreme biological purpose of marital unions; but it is fairly well recognised that marriage has an individual and social value apart from propagation. To some humane minds, it seems a cruel course to forbid wedlock to one already handicapped in life's battle by consumption. The opponents of eugenics often refer to such instances, and ask why society should add fresh penalties to those imposed by natural heredity. It is well known that many consumptives are beautiful moral characters, possessing conspicuous gentleness, hopefulness, and kindness of disposition. They are, moreover, susceptible to love, and they crave tender affection. A predisposition to tuberculosis is sometimes accompanied by intellectual or artistic power. It is hard, indeed, that these patient sufferers should

[1] Sir James Barr, in his Presidential Address to the British Medical Association, 1912, said: "Medical men, when they are consulted, as they often are, on questions of matrimony and reproduction, incur a very serious responsibility when they encourage the mating of physical weaklings."

be debarred from the chief human felicity and solace.

This question is one of ethics and racial hygiene. Those persons who place reproduction as the sole *raison d'être* of matrimony would say that these unfortunate beings must resign themselves to a single life. Those who hold that marriage is possible and permissible without procreation would be disposed to counsel wedlock. A scientific humanist might advise resort to sterilisation before marriage, on the plea that reproduction from unhealthy progenitors is a flagrant social sin. The determination of this question on a sound moral and social basis may become ultimately the task of earnest humanists.

The enforced celibacy of recidivists and congenital, incurable criminals has often been recommended by penologists and race-culturists. For the confirmed offenders there seems to be but one course—segregation in colonies for life. The irreclaimable delinquent is the victim of "a radically bad organisation."[1] He commits crime because deep-rooted impulse drives him to it. Often his offence seems motiveless, and after its commission he is bewildered by his own action. He is on the border-line of insanity, if not actually insane, and wholly irresponsible. Dr C. Goring, of Parkhurst Prison, says: "The one vital mental constitutional factor in the etiology of crime is defective intelligence." The congenital criminal is mostly insensitive to all sympathetic or scientific efforts to cure his propensity. When liberated from prison, and given a chance of reformation, he reverts to crime, urged on by a force that he cannot resist. He is an unhappy being, a curse to himself and a peril to his neighbours. His moral sense is extremely feeble, or entirely absent. He is usually quite amoral and devoid of social sympathy. His heredity is bad; he is epileptoid, morbid, subject to hallucinations, scrofulous, tuberculous, asthenic, degenerate. In all ages and in all civilised nations, these wretched victims of a tyrannous organisation have been punished without

[1] Henry Maudsley, "Pathology of Mind." See also "The Criminal," Havelock Ellis; "The Female Offender," Lombroso; "Criminal Sociology," Ferri; "The Criminal Mind," De Fleury.

any true understanding of their depravity and its origin. They have suffered savage legal reprisals and tortures without avail; and during their short spells of liberty, they have been allowed to reproduce their fatal qualities in their children. Such is the bungling way of legislators, who stubbornly close their ears to the teaching of science. The crowd pays for their folly by providing finances for the building of new convict prisons and county asylums, the maintenance of a huge army of police, and the cost of jurisdiction. This wasteful, futile, iniquitous travesty of reason, justice and humanity will, in the future, be accounted one of the worst evils of a civilisation that was more concerned to revenge itself upon the wretched criminal than to sever and destroy the roots of crime.

The creed that any fool can be a father must be rejected for a religious belief in individual responsibility to children and to the race. This is true patriotism and true loyalty to one's country. It is a faith of glorious promise for humanity. To ensure morality, we must breed morality. This course is ten times more economic than the system of reckless, immoral procreation, and cumbrous, ineffective attempts to stamp out crime and sin by pious threats and violent legal penalties. The solemn responsibility of procreation should be taught by every religious and ethical teacher. The young of both sexes should learn reverently that they bear within them an undying force, the source of life, the seed of the race.

That society is awakening tardily to the imperative demand for enlightenment in this vast subject, is shown by the publication of a series of useful booklets under the auspices of the National Council of Public Morals. Ten of these brochures have been issued during the past few years, under the editorship of the Rev. James Marchant. They may be commended as a scientific and moral effort to bring knowledge to the mass of the people, relating to race-regeneration and sexual hygiene. These tracts upon great topics are superior in every sense to some of the widely circulated books upon sex questions, in which negative moralisms predominate, and very little that is positive and really helpful is said.

CHAPTER XI

CELIBACY AND THE LAW

LAW-MAKERS in all ages have recognised that the widespread spurious celibacy, or pseudo-continence of the unmarried, and the unchastity of the married, demand measures of prevention, restraint and correction. The history of State interference with the sex morals, predilections, and practices of its subjects is voluminous and deeply instructive. A moral ideal of chastity in celibate life grew naturally in the human mind in many quarters of the globe. It was, and is still, an ideal of barbarous and partly cultured people as well as of the most highly developed races.

Sexual conduct, the most intimate, private, personal affair of human life, may seem to be something beyond and immune from any social intervention or legal control. But it has never been so regarded. There are manifold pleas whereby interference and control are justified. There are also valid arguments that such direction may be oblique, arbitrary, tyrannous, and grotesque. The injustices and the blunderings can only be appreciated by results and a careful study of present-day conditions. Serious scientific inquiry into the psychology of sex is only just beginning in even the most cultured of nations. Hence a mass of canonical, legal, social and domestic regulations, proscriptions and tabus, and many ethical, hygienic and medical counsels, are gradually being exposed as inimical to morality, the well-being of men and women, the health of the community, and the stability of the race. In no domain of knowledge has there been so much error, misapprehension, obfuscation, stubborn resistance to the light, and superstition, as in the atti-

tude towards the relationship of the sexes. The almost universal abnormality and morbidity of the *vita sexualis* among the civilised is massive evidence of the sinister darkness of ignorance that has surrounded sex.

The method of a man's response to the erotic impulse is largely a key to his whole character. We are spiritual, virtuous, social in relation to the fashion in which we love. It needed no profound inspiration among primitive tribes to enlighten them as to the imperative necessity for regulating the union of the sexes. Any form of marriage soon becomes an economic contract, and for the preservation of the community there must be definite responsibilities relating to offspring. Property-owning, if it means only the possession of weapons, tools, a hovel, or a goat, requires recognition of paternity and kinship. A scarcity of men, through conflict or disproportionate birth of the sexes, brings about the biological necessity for polygamy; and this form of marriage must be encouraged, controlled and protected by chiefs and counsellors. A redundance of women tends naturally to polygamy in primitive societies. Under this condition there must be rules regulating the harem, effecting wives and concubines, and the proper maintenance of children.

The mating of men and women reacts on the group, the tribe, and the race, and is not a simple agreement for the cohabitation of two persons. When any of the practices of marriage, monogamic, polygamous, polyandrous, adelphic or communal, are found to meet the needs of a people, there is necessary provision still remaining for the ordering of the unmated. The celibate man must not be permitted to encroach on the rights of the wedded; and the virgin, in many instances, must guard and retain the purity that gives her prime value as a bride. Severe and often cruel reprisals are made by the tribe upon the incontinence of the unmarried, and for adultery. In some communities these offences are religious, in others social or civic. Even where sexual laxity prevails, there are forms of communal control. It is difficult to find general chaotic promiscuity in any, even of the lowest, groups of mankind. Every form of human marriage is fore-

shadowed among animals, but promiscuous coupling is not a common phenomenon.

The Jews under Moses had a very elaborate code directing sex morals and marriage. Adultery on suspicion was tried, in the case of women, by the barbarous test of ordeal. The adultery of men with bondmaids was punished by scourging, and with free women by the death of both persons. Incest was forbidden under penalty of burning alive. Breach of chastity in virgins was punished by public stoning to death. This austere concern for chastity was accompanied by a discouragement of lifelong celibacy. Perpetual virginity was deemed a misfortune and disgrace, as evidenced in the story of Jephthah's daughter. Bastards were forbidden to enter the congregation of the Lord, even to the tenth generation.

St Paul was scarcely an ardent advocate of marriage, though he condemned extra-conjugal intercourse. The Epistles reveal that the Apostle was an ascetic, who regarded wedlock chiefly as a means of avoiding fornication. "I say therefore to the unmarried and widows, it is good for them if they abide even as I."

Under Mohammedan law, in its pristine form, illicit unions of the sexes were sternly interdicted. Mohammed enjoined flogging for those who falsely accused innocent women of incontinence. Promiscuous sex relationships were denounced. Adultery was a capital offence; but as four eye-witnesses to the act were necessary before a sentence could be imposed, the accusation was not often made.

Islam has always abhorred celibacy. Lane, the traveller, was ostracised by his neighbours in Egypt because he was unmarried, and he found it difficult to obtain a dwelling. He was told that the purchase of a concubine would ensure his social respect. Mohammedanism discountenances the life of celibacy, while it condemns ephemeral association of the sexes.

In India "The Laws of Manu" and "The Institutes of Vishnu" formulated strict rules in respect to sexual morality and marriage. Here, as elsewhere in the East, marriage is counselled, but all illicit intimacy is condemned. Both true and pseudo-celibacy are rare in oriental communities.

I need not accumulate instances to demonstrate that all human societies have exerted authority in the regulation of the sex relationship. The ideals, the codes, the customs have varied from age to age, and in different climates and quarters of the earth; but control has always been exercised in one form or another.

With the rise of ecclesiastic power in Christendom, sexual affairs were directed by the Church. A new sacred significance was attached to marriage, and a number of laws instituted for its regulation. The vow of chastity was enforced upon priests and nuns, and though matrimony was sanctioned among the laity, the Pauline ascetic ideal was revered. The repudiation of the view that marriage was a better state than virginity is said to have been made public by the Council of Trent. A belief in the superior morality of celibacy still lingers in a nebulous, but perceptible, form, and tinges the view of a large number of even educated people in appraising questions of sex.

The ascendancy of the Church in secular domination brought a new attitude towards licence. A breach of chastity was not only a sin against God, but a crime in law. As late as the eighteenth century, in France, extra-matrimonial intercourse was regarded as a civic crime, and was punished by legislation. In England the Puritans inflicted penalties upon fornication. An act of 1653 condemned both delinquents to three months' imprisonment. At the same time, adultery by a married woman was punishable by death; but there was no provision made for the infidelity of husbands.

Buckle, Lecky, and several other historians have shown that Puritanic austerity and tyranny in attempted furtherance of morality have failed with signal regularity; yet a great many persons still place hope and confidence in the legal enforcement of chastity, conjugal fidelity, and purity of public life and manners by means of punishment. History of the past and the present proves beyond question that legal efforts at suppression very rarely indeed achieve success. Often such effort increases the evil.

There is no more instructive testimony of the failure of the law in matters of sex morality than that afforded by the crusades of governments, municipalities, and

societies against prostitution. Again and again, states and communities have resorted to harsh and sometimes cruel measures for banishing the social evil. At the best, the evil has only been hunted out of one corner into another. The more drastic the methods, the more ignominious the ultimate defeat. Every humane and reflective man and woman desires a cessation of this disgraceful helotry, the source of infinite degradation, suffering, disease, and racial poisoning. But the abolition of sexual vice is an undertaking so vast, so complicated, and so difficult that the ordinary efforts of legislators can only appear puny to the experienced investigator of the problem.

The annihilation of prostitution involves the destruction of a number of firmly founded institutions, the shattering of the present code of industrial ethics, the modification of marriage laws, an attack on vested interests, a revolution in economic conditions. After this indispensable clearing of the ground, we shall be in a position to reconstruct a society that will refuse to regard prostitution as a calamitous "necessity"; a society that has outgrown the alleged need for such shameful traffic. The suppression of the social evil will come with a change of men's hearts, as every other moral reform has come; and not by the blundering and ineffectual machinery of police raids, harryings, fines, and penalties.

Before we can hope to banish this deeply rooted and vigorous vice, there must be an end of the folly and the evil of withholding and darkening knowledge of the facts of the sexual life. The hygiene of sex must become the proper study of legislators, jurists, teachers, ministers, parents. We must lift sex from the appalling slough in which it has been cast by an immoral prudery and an immoral levity and callousness. Reform in this matter must begin in the brain and heart of every man and woman in the nation. It is too colossal a task for petty councils and drawing-room committees. The evil is formidable, but not invincible and ineradicable. There are still societies of human beings who are free from prostitution, and to which the argument of "necessary evil" would be meaningless.

The Church and the law in their interposition in the sex relationship have promulgated negative counsels and framed stringent codes. Only in modern times has there been any true attempt, clerical or legislative, to understand the social diseases that call for remedy. Ecclesiastics and parliamentarians merely condemned and punished, without any searching inquiry into the manifold and complex causes of irregularity and licence. Nowadays the Church is very slowly awakening to the primary fact that it is futile to attack a social disease, which is not first understood in all its origins, symptons, and bearings. In Germany, Lutheran pastors have in late years conducted an investigation as to the causes and conditions of widespread sexual laxity; and this inquiry, though imperfect, has at least afforded matter for reflection before drastic action. The numerous sacerdotal assaults made from age to age on immorality have almost constantly failed in their object. Repeatedly the evil has been increased, the offenders rendered more furtive and hypocritical, and the offences made more abnormal. The ancient austerity of the Kirk in Scotland has never lessened the number of illegitimate births in that country. Cruel old-time enactments against immorality in Edinburgh have not cleansed that city.

In his day Lecky averred that prostitution was "in no other European country so hopelessly vicious or so irrevocable" as in England. There are signs that the degradation is less to-day; but whatever change may be noted is not due to the infliction of penalties. The improvement is the result of moralising influences attributable to more humane and broader education. Neglect of instruction in the hygiene of sex is accountable for incalculable suffering, vice, and ill-health. The Vice-Commission of Chicago, in their 1911 report, recommend the teaching of sex-hygiene in schools "under carefully trained and scientifically instructed teachers. For younger children the parents should do the teaching as the part of a sacred duty."

The Commissioners urge that: "Many of the immoral influences and dangers which are constantly surrounding young children on the street, in their amusements,

and in business life, may be counteracted and minimised by proper moral teaching and scientific instruction. Educators have come to feel something should be done directly by teachers in schools and elsewhere to impart some kind of instruction to counteract the evil knowledge which children acquire from evil sources."

The Chicago Vice-Commissioners' conclusions are highly valuable and instructive. They offer an instance of the development of a scientific, prophylactic method of grappling with the evil of prostitution. Some of the modes of repression may be criticised; but on the whole, the report is encouraging. There is clear recognition of the truth that reform must begin with a higher education in the art of life: "Until the hearts of men are changed we can hope for no absolute annihilation of the Social Evil. Religion and education alone can correct the greatest curse which to-day rests upon mankind." The Chicago inquiry shows that legislative authority is not universally deceived by the false promise of social hygiene through the system of regulation and segregation. "The commission is convinced that the so-called system has proved itself degenerating and ineffective."

The pseudo-celibacy of a multitude of men gives rise to innumerable ills of society that perturb the minds of the governing class in all civilised countries. It is perfectly just that authority should restrain its subjects from actions that injure society. But laws do not convert men's hearts, and the law is never a powerful weapon against sexual vice. The great effort of Maria Theresa to suppress prostitution and illicit amours in Vienna proved entirely abortive. In spite of the passing of severe acts prohibiting waitresses in cafés, the wearing of short dresses, and the imposition of fines, imprisonment and flogging upon offenders, the Chastity Commission was a source of the very evils that it set out to cure. Illegitimate births are more frequent in Vienna than in any other great city of Europe.[1]

All law referring to the offences that are fostered by compulsory celibacy must be founded on a broad knowledge of human nature, a comprehensive appreciation of

[1] "Die Prostitution in Wien," J. Schrank. See also "Sex in Relation to Society," by Havelock Ellis.

past history, and a painstaking accumulation of facts. Prior to action, the whole bearing of the proposed reform must be cautiously reviewed. Law merely forbids and punishes. It does not dig down to the roots of an evil and attack it at the source. Law relies mostly on severity of penalty as a remedy. History demonstrates that severity is almost normally and universally ineffective in reform and prevention.

It behoves the thoughtful and truly loyal citizen to watch the action of legislators in all attempts to compel sexual morality. Science cannot be excluded from legal measures of reform without lamentable consequences. Moral amelioration through the law is only possible when law-makers are broadly cultured, far-seeing, and more concerned with the eradication of the causes of vice than the infliction of extreme punishment upon the vicious.

One of the deterrents to marriage, and a source of ever-growing discontent, is the state of the law regarding divorce. The system of legal separation for the ill-adapted in wedlock is no aid whatever to readjustment. Legal severance that inhibits reunion is a remarkable paradox. It is a fruitful source of sexual irregularity in both sexes. The Divorce Law is a flagrant example of sex inequality, inasmuch as a wife is not entitled to dismiss a husband for adultery, though the husband may divorce a wife on this plea alone. Our system of divorce has been aptly summed up as "unequal, immoral, contradictory, illogical, uncertain, and unsuited to present requirements."[1]

The reality of marriage is of far greater moral value than its enforced permanence. This principle has been recognised in past civilisations, and is beginning to influence the thought of present-day civilised societies in a marked degree. We have been wont to accept the shadow for the substance. Felicitous marriages, united marriages, healthy marriages, are not made by law. They are the result of fortuitous conditions, good fortune or skill in selection, adaptability in conjugal life, and the mutual sharing of interests and pleasures. They are the outcome of love.

The Romans wisely recognised that marriage is a

[1] "The Question of English Divorce."

private contract between a man and a woman. Living together for a year constituted marriage. Divorce was free and equal for men and women, and separation was a private matter of the couple, though the severance was publicly announced. The institution of the ancient Jewish law of marriage, with its patriarchal inequalities affecting wives, led, under Christianity, to a prohibition of divorce by consent.

The moral equality of women with men was clearly admitted by the Romans. Gradually the new creed and the modified attitude of the law banished this equality. It has been pointed out that the Teutonic influence in Europe is largely accountable for the subjection of women. When the victorious and barbarous German hosts swept the Continent, they brought with them traditions and customs that degraded the wife to the position of a slave.

The law, while it professes to defend the holy state of matrimony, piles up hindrances to marriage by forbidding readjustments. A judicially separated pair cannot enter into another licit union. They are doomed to celibacy, or indirectly incited to illicit association. The difficulty of escaping from the Procrustean bed of wedlock makes the cautious and reflective hesitate before taking the risk.

It is impossible to compute the hardship, sorrow, and exasperation that this inequality of the law inflicts upon thousands of men and women. We actually penalise the man or woman who, from a high sense of the dignity and sacredness of conjugal love, elects to sever a union that is no longer moral, tolerable, and beneficial to society. We encourage marital discord, and foster an atmosphere of domestic strife, that reacts with grave injury upon the husband and wife and the children. The very desire for divorce is, in numerous cases, a plain testimony that the parties cherish a fine conception of love and marriage. Yet a huge mass of legal obstacles are placed in the path of these conscientious persons. So appalling are these hindrances that many utterly incompatible partners are forced to waste their lives and their social potentiality in an association that mocks at love and makes a travesty and often a tragedy of marriage. "The family is the unit of the state,

therefore the state makes laws, not for love, but for the family. Happy that family the parents of which are bound by cosmic not by municipal affection. Nevertheless, say what one will, Love scoffs at laws, howsoever marriage and divorce may be regulated by parliamentary statute." [1]

Law recognises everywhere that men and women must be held responsible for the children that they propagate; and most of the marriage enactments are based upon this estimate of responsibility to offspring and potential citizens of the state. Government, in our own country at least, is content to-day to regulate the family life, and does not interfere actively with the irregularities of the extra-matrimonial amatory life. In the time of Cromwell, the lapses of the unmarried could be punished by a term of imprisonment, and the erring wife was guilty of a crime which incurred even the penalty of death. This measure did not apply to the unfaithful husband.

Gradually, legislators learn to recognise that morality in sex matters develops through education in the sense of social responsibility, and in individual self-imposed restraints, and that stringent laws divert but do not annihilate vicious tendencies. Rigid codes often cause exasperation and rebellion, and an antipathy to morality itself. In spite of past drastic penalties, it is stated by thoughtful observers in the Western civilisations that probably there is as much extra-marital irregularity as regulated marital cohabitation. Such irregularity can be increased or lessened, and it is the task of reformers to ascertain the social remedies for decreasing it.

[1] "Hints for Lovers," Arnold Haultain.

CHAPTER XII

ADOLESCENT RESTRAINT AND PRE-MARITAL CELIBACY

COMMUNITIES of animals that practise association in the care of the young may be likened to human societies. Sexual love is the basis of human sociability. Reproduction in animals and in man compels altruism, self-sacrifice, and self-imposed restraints. The male is instinctively impelled to protect the female while she is bearing and rearing offspring, and to provide her and the progeny with food. This parental and social impulse is well illustrated in the sex-life of birds and most of the higher mammalia.

It is probable that this impulsion may extend in man in another form, and become a reasoned process for the good of the race and posterity. Scientific selection in love does not abolish love, as imperfectly informed persons are prone to imagine. When a husband and wife refrain on moral grounds from procreating a new life, because the wife is not physically capable of bearing a normal, healthy infant, it is not that marital love is waning. It is an instance of two reflective persons with a well-developed social sense and a standard of responsibility towards posterity. Consanguinity is made a bar to marriage, and few persons rebel against the canonical decree, because the interdiction is estimated as beneficial to society.

The day is approaching in civilised states, when men and women will realise that the giving of life to hopelessly tainted, insane, or mattoid beings is a sin. Eugenics is not the enforced breeding of selected parents, and an adoption of the methods of the stock-raiser. It is simply education in the sane genesis of human life. It is of the same moral essence as the

refusal of a conscientious woman, even at the cost of a sacrifice of affection, to marry a victim of alcoholism for fear that his children may be degenerate or sickly.

Nature's sanction for marriage is the fitness and fecundity of the male and the female. The only real hygienic criterion must be the eugenic. According to the Protestant marriage service, the paramount object of matrimony is the procreation of offspring. If we accept this, it is our duty to heed that children are well-born, potentially useful citizens, and not congenital criminals, syphilitics, idiots, and hopeless defectives. Only the broadening of education, and the diffusion of ideals of responsibility towards children and the future of the race, can check the reckless and utterly immoral production of the diseased and the crippled from birth.

To ensure a healthy population, it is necessary to produce offspring from the soundest stock. We have seen that late marriage favours the reproduction of children with diminished vigour and a tendency to ill-health. Prudent voluntary selection, regard to sexual hygiene, and the care of the mothers, would in a few generations banish a host of social evils. Such precautions would lessen disease, crime, insanity and pauperism, and raise to an incalculable degree the status of general well-being.

Immature wedlock and deferred marriage are both bad for the community and the race. Nature has set the rule for the exercise of the reproductive function during the period of highest virility and fecundity. Man alone among the animals has disregarded this law. Casual, uncontrolled sexual selection and chance breeding are carefully guarded against in the rearing of domesticated animals. The reproduction of civilised human beings is haphazard. Pinard has declared that we propagate now as carelessly as our ancestors of the Stone Age.

Stirpiculture must be employed without fanaticism or excess. Love is the source of pairing and of generation, and no scheme of race-culture can disregard or minimise the supreme essential of love. Sir Francis Galton, Professor Karl Pearson, Metchnikoff, Professor J. Arthur Thomson, and many other scientific humanists recognise in prudent personal choice, and hygienic

procreation, a splendid promise for the future weal of humanity.

Physical and mental qualifications in parents are of vastly deeper importance than the conventional ideas of the standard of incomes in marriage. A wealthy sot, or an incurably diseased person, is able to marry, and to reproduce the effects of his tendency or his pathological condition in several children; while the sober, healthy man of insufficient means is either debarred from wedlock altogether, or forced to postpone the age of marriage until he is no longer a potentially vigorous father. The iron-bound commercial standard enters into all our calculations, and thwarts the free play of instinct and natural tendency. "A good match" means, in everyday speech, the marriage in which money is considered of far higher concern than the mental and physical adaptation of the partners.

Large numbers of the fittest men and women are condemned to a species of sterilisation, through insistence upon the prohibitive costliness of marriage, or through sheer pecuniary necessity. Men and women of intellect, refined emotions, and acute social instincts are inhibited from marrying and handing down their qualities, because society has not yet learned that thought is the greatest national asset, and that thinkers should share in the common right of sufficient food and the wherewithal to establish a family. On the other hand, the mattoid, the alcoholic, the illiterate, and the socially irresponsible are free in large numbers from the blight of indigence, and able to reproduce their defects and vices without check or hindrance. This grave procreative waste is one of the chief evils of latter-day commercial, as opposed to cultured, progress.

If the lofty purpose of the Christian religion is to make people better, our ecclesiastic leaders and the exponents of Christianity should strive with all their power to secure that we shall be well-born. To ensure good parentage, the education of the individual must begin at the right age. The proper period for instilling a sense of social and racial responsibility through reverence for human life, for the body and its momentous functions, and for love, is during adolescence. Every thoughtful person knows that youth is

a season of emotional and mental stress, due to the awakening of the sex-instinct. This period of receptivity to moral ideas and religious influences, accompanied by nebulous reflection upon newly aroused desires, and a yearning for light, is one of the most critical stages in life's journey. Too often, mental misery, and moral distortion, or corruption, depress and bewilder the mind, and leave a lifelong trace on the psychic being. The study of the psychology of puberty and adolescence is of the deepest significance. Like most of the vital questions, this study has been lamentably neglected. A great field of human inquiry has remained untouched and unexplored till recent years.

It is necessary to devote attention to the fruits of the adolescent stage, in modern civilised societies, upon the question of celibacy and marriage. Broadly speaking, there is no systematic preparation whatever for the adult sex-life during the time when desires of a massive and often overwhelming character are conflicting in the soul of youth. Tens of thousands of boys and a greater number of girls in English Christian homes never receive the barest rudimentary instruction in sexual hygiene. The mysteries of reproduction are conveyed by ignorant companions, or learned by means of gutter phrases and symbols. The boy is often a pornographist before he has had a chance to learn the beauty and sacredness of sex-love. The girl is usually quite ignorant, or morbidly prudish. At a certain crisis of puberty, many girls develop hysteria through ignorance and shock.[1] Millions—not merely thousands—of young men exhibit psychoneuroses of more or less marked type, through mental complexes, conflicts, and despair.

Principal Stanley Hall relates that a New York broker had "3,000,000 confidential letters written to advertising medical companies and doctors, mostly by youths with their heart's blood and under assurances of secrecy, which are sold at fixed syndicate prices."

[1] Compare "The Psychopathology of Hysteria," by Dr Charles D. Fox; "Psychanalysis," by Dr Brill; "Sexual Ethics," by Professor R. Michels; and "Adolescence," by Principal Stanley Hall.

Stanley Hall says that he could have bought 7,000,000 of these letters. This well-organised scheme for battening on the ignorant and distressed was the inspiration of a clever man of business, who realised that an enormous proportion of adolescents suffer tortures of soul through morbid preoccupation with physiological changes and manifestations which they do not understand. In many cases infinite relief would ensue upon a confidential talk with a sensible psychotherapeutist, or maybe with an older and more intelligent man without any special knowledge of sexual psychology.

A common phase of celibacy known wherever man is found, and described as "auto-erotism," in modern psychopathy, leads to much suffering of mind amongst the young. The latest investigation of several eminent physicians and other qualified persons shows that secret remorse for this propensity plays havoc in sensitive minds, which reacts upon bodily function. In England, Maudsley, Clouston, Sir James Paget, Anstie, Gowers, Havelock Ellis, and in America, Brill and other well-known physicians, have contributed authoritative opinion to this inquiry. Continental research has been more thorough. In France, Pouillet, Fournier, Garnier, Féré, Gilles de la Tourette, J. Dejerine, E. Gauchler and many others have given attention to the phenomenon. In Italy the subject has been discussed by Marro, Lombroso, and Mantegazza. German psychopathologists have written exhaustively on the question. Forel, of Zurich, writes earnestly upon this evil.

The flowering age of human life is often darkened by doubts and dreads arising from unguided sexual speculation and injurious habits. I repeat, with all earnestness, that the perils of celibacy are increased by the deplorable reticence of parents, teachers, and clergymen, who are responsible for the moral education of the young. In regard to sex-teaching, Stanley Hall writes: "This probably ought to be the most inspiring of all topics to teach, as to the truly pure in heart it is the most beautiful of all."

In the psychic and nervous organism, the errors of adolescence set up a number of disturbances, sometimes of a grave character. Most of the authorities

assert that extreme malpractice causes a morbid fear of marriage, or a recoil from normal love. This is the most serious result of the evil among women; and this specific repugnance is far more prevalent than the average person imagines. It is well known to widely experienced gynæcologists, alienists, and specialists in nervous diseases. Garnier declares that this abnormality is a common cause of voluntary prolonged celibacy, or of total abstention from marriage in both sexes.[1]

The lessening of this evil of adolescence should be the aim of a systematic national hygienic education. Ignorance, not innate vice, is the chief source of the failings of humanity. Knowledge is the beacon-light of morality. Love should be reverenced, and there should be no foolish effort to dissever sex-passion from psychic affection. This atavistic, paradoxical tendency to exclude sexual desire from a concept of sex-love is a relic of a false ideal of asceticism. The clash, the complexes, and the shocks that this idle and mischievous sophistry imposes upon the mind and the emotions are beyond calculation. Sheer distortion of view and judgment arise from this folly. The results upon the psychic nature of women are most baneful.

Adolescence and immaturity should be the preparatory stage for the functions of maturity. For social and sanitary reasons, the youth cannot be encouraged to marry until he is fully developed in body. Conjugality must be postponed for the girl until she is physically capable of giving birth to healthy children. Restraint must be learned early; for the erotic emotion often arises spontaneously in quite ignorant children of both sexes.

This control of instinct is one of the problems of adolescent training. The earliest impressions upon the child's mind are formed by the mother; and unfortunately the mother is usually quite unenlightened as to the secret meditations and desires of puberty. Perverted habits may be contracted without arousing the slightest parental suspicion. Sane and kindly sex-teaching is imperative at this age.

There are few indeed among the scientific sexualo-

[1] "Célibat et Célibataires."

gists who do not commend inviolate chastity prior to marriage. But mere moral counsels often fail. Our feverish social life is beset with insidious and direct temptations, and the erotic stimuli tend to increase with civilisation. Continence becomes one of the severest disciplines when luxury spreads in a society. Hard work and poverty tend to lessen impulse and to restrain incontinence. Idleness and easy living induce a directly opposite tendency.

Among the perverted outlets of enforced celibacy the habit of flirting is one of the most common. It is often supposed that this playing at love is quite normal, and even beneficial as a kind of preliminary to real passion. This view requires cautious qualification. Flirting, or " flirtage " as it is called in America, may be a healthy, tentative play of selection and a prelude to serious courtship. It is, however, a practice fraught with manifest risks. Flirting is often a form of sex-dissipation, and injurious in certain important regards, even though it is considered harmless in the moral sense. The habit may become a passion. It is not true that the confirmed flirt usually settles down contentedly to sober matrimonial life. Flirts are often of the varietist type of lovers who are incapable of constancy. A long experience in flirting is not the best preparation for married fidelity. Often the flirt marries late in life, or never marries.

It is significant that in those countries where flirting is very prevalent, and raised to a cult, there is but slight recognition of the art of love in marriage. The frittering of sentiment, and the constant amative stimulation of habitual flirtations, impair the capacity for a real and abiding passion in wedlock. Men and women who have " got over their love-making " before union do not make the happiest husbands and wives. Love is even more imperative in conjugality than in wooing. This is not only true for the married pair themselves. Ardour and tenderness are essential for the giving of birth to good offspring. Conjugal lovers are rarely unloving parents, and their children are nurtured in an atmosphere of family affection.

Adolescents should be taught that love is not mere errantry, coquetry, and frivolous amusement, but a

noble and beautiful emotion that unites the sexes for a sacred purpose, and exalts human nature. At the outset of a young man's preoccupation with love, and his attraction towards a maiden, he should be able to confide freely in the sympathetic ear of a wise mother, who has known the fears, the perplexities, and the strange raptures of first love.

Loving parental direction and sympathy should counteract the blighting influence of the vulgar, worldly appraisement of love and marriage. Before the boy and the girl are exposed to the contaminations that await them, a true purity of heart should be fostered in the home training and environment. *A society that imposes prolonged celibacy upon its members should make that state practicable and real.* As it is, the penalty is enforced without any effort to mitigate its pains and dangers. The young are told to be "pure." This is the beginning and the end of education in sex-morality in the majority of homes.

Purity is preached as a negative virtue imperative for morality. It should be inculcated as a positive virtue. Chastity is usually accepted as synonymous with purity; but human history proves that a positive purity is not the same thing as rigid sexual continence. The strictly abstinent genital neurasthenic cannot be accepted as a type of true purity of mind. Purity is a moral attitude as well as a practice of physical virtue. It is not apparent in the morbid, tortured ascetic in his cell, who is constantly assailed by lascivious desire; but it may be innate in the Magdalen who has erred through depth of affection. Purity should be encouraged, not solely as negation of unruly desires, but as a spiritual grace, a mode of refined thought, a right evaluation of chastity and restraint, and a respect for sexual love as a mighty life-force. This high ideal of sexual purity is very slowly growing among the more cultured ethicists in Christendom. The ideal is not merely preservation of bodily purity; it is the cultivation of clean thought and sane ideas concerning sex-love.

During the natural celibacy of youth, the path might be made less perilous by plain warning and guidance. It is sad to reflect upon the large number of sexual phobias, neurasthenic symptoms, hysterical manifesta-

tions, perversities of desire, and serious neuroses caused by mental complexes, shocks, obsessional thoughts, and vicious example during the early years of life. Many of us outlive, through painful striving, the dire psychic and moral consequences of the deep ignorance of adolescence. Others never recover from the lesions of the soul and mind. Some, stricken with fear or remorse, shrink from marriage; and not a few commit suicide in despair. Unfortunately we underestimate the tangled ramifications of the sex-impulse, which begin to spread in all directions during puberty and adolescence. The very secrecy with which this process is surrounded complicates it, and conduces to morbidity and abnormality.

The postponement of marriage, the only religiously sanctioned form of sex-relationship, is in some cases imperative and quite essential for the well-being of the individual and society. But the way of celibacy is made harder by the lack of true moral and hygienic teaching concerning the means of preserving chastity. We enjoin purity upon youth; but our moral exhortations are not supported by sound instruction in the regimen of continence. Youth is surrounded by tempting and forbidden fruit, and many yield to temptation, because the power of resistance is not deep-based in the will by a supreme concept of the high value of sexual purity. Love, not fear, should make us chaste.

CHAPTER XIII

THE RESULTS OF CELIBACY

Apart from its influence upon population and national stability, celibacy induces definite evils among the single units of society. Some of the fruits of celibacy have been noted in preceding chapters. Much remains to be said; so much indeed, that the subject can only be glanced at in the compass of this inquiry. Our investigation of the consequences of prolonged or permanent celibacy may begin with an examination of the results upon the moral and psychic nature of men and women. The extent and influence of the range, radiations, and permeation of the sexual impulse was only dimly recognised in the earliest days of physiological research and the science of medicine. Hippocrates and Plato associated hysteria in women with the reproductive system, and stimulated an inquiry that has lasted to this day.

The ramifications of the instinct into unsuspected and obscure recesses of the psychic being, and its wide-reaching influence upon emotion, thought, and conduct, were scarcely surmised by physiologists, philosophers, and physicians during centuries of culture. Ancient Grecian physicians, who probably gained most of their knowledge from Egypt, had a very defective acquaintance with physiology and anatomy. Aristotle asserted that the nerves originate from the heart. Galen demonstrated that the nerves are of two orders, and are connected with the brain and spinal cord .

It has been said that Aristotle, in his treatise "On the Soul," paved the way for psychology; for he was

the first inquirer of his age who associated the soul with physical matter and function. Both physiology and psychology still offer vast unexplored regions; but these sciences have made remarkable strides during the past fifty years. This is shown by the great advance in the methods of treating insanity and the minor neuroses and psychoses, a wider knowledge of hysteria and its causation, and perhaps, in a lesser degree, by the continental researches in the psychology of sex.

Scientific and medical investigation reveals more clearly with the steady advance of knowledge that the *vita sexualis* is not only concerned with the propagation of the species, but is intimately bound up with the moral and psychic life, and related to most functions of the body. Freud, one of the foremost pioneers in psychotherapy, was, at the outset of his studies, critical of the view of this extremely intimate association, and rather disposed to reject any connection between the sexual system and neuroses. His long and laborious researches brought conviction that the conventional upbringing of women in complete, or almost complete, ignorance of their most powerful feelings frequently results in serious mental shocks when the mind is confronted with facts that have never been recognised; and that these shocks produce lesions of a psychic character that may give rise to morbid manifestations. Maudsley, McGillicuddy, and numerous mental pathologists have pointed out the close connection between the mind and all the organs of the body. The study of puberty is full of striking evidence of the influence of the awakening physical power upon the thoughts and emotions of youth. Hysteria and neurasthenia afford remarkable instances.

The newer psychology is teaching us the vast range of the genesic impulse throughout the psychic being. Formerly the instinct was located by physiologists in the cerebellum, which the phrenologist Gall asserted to be the seat of the lower passions. It is now recognised that sex-emotion is on a much higher plane than simple "animal instinct" or "lower passions." In woman it is highly diffused, variable, and more complicated than in man. Dr Clouston refers to the

dominant function of reproduction in women, and states that it has " far larger, if not more intense, relationships to feeling, judgment and volition " than in the male. Matthews Duncan, W. Balls-Headley, Kisch, and many other medical authorities have asserted the enormous force of the primitive yearnings in women for love and motherhood.

Dr W. Balls-Headley, from a long experience in treating the ailments of women, is extremely sensible of " the present wretched sexual relations of women." Every earnest woman of feminist fervour, and zeal for the upraising of humanity, will find a sympathetic, deep understanding of one of the great problems of womanhood in this writer's conclusions. " A large proportion of women are deprived of the use of their strongest instinct—the production of the next generation—and an unnatural state is induced. We are but in an evolutionary, transitory stage intermediate between partial incontinence and monogamy."

Dr Balls-Headley deplores the decrease in marriages, the deferment of the age of brides at the time of marriage in Australia, and the reluctance of men to wed in the early years of manhood. He ascribes several grave physical and mental troubles in women to enforced celibacy. His view of feminine apathy towards marriage is that " the degeneration or absence of the sexual instinct or appetite is representative of the degeneration or diminution of the race." [1]

Many mental physicians have testified that a tendency to nerve derangement and pyschic distress is common in normal women of from twenty-five to thirty-five. Comparatively few women of about the age of thirty escape the more or less evident perils of an unnatural state of life. Havelock Ellis says that the diffused character of the sexual emotions in women is such that many women do not even recognise the emotions. There is little doubt that the erotic sphere in women is very closely linked to all the higher psychic manifestations. Scarcely any alienists will deny this conclusion. Hardly a thoughtful woman will conscientiously repudiate the poet's view that, for most of her sex at least, love is the whole of existence.

[1] " The Evolution of the Diseases of Women."

THE RESULTS OF CELIBACY

Dr Havelburg, discussing celibacy, states "Marriage is a psychological factor which is necessary for the physical welfare of man as well as woman . . . The bodily appearance of married men and women always improves in consequence of their regular mode of life; the commencement of senile decay is materially postponed."[1]

There can be, in fact, no proper comparison of the love-emotion of men and women; the range of variation, the complexity, the diffusion, and the influence of the passion in woman greatly differentiates the emotion from that experienced by man. *Souvent femme varie!* This complexity, according to Dr Harry Campbell, "predisposes the woman to nervous troubles. . . . Her nervousness is, in fact, more or less co-extensive with her sexual life."[2]

Professor J. Dejerine finds that protracted celibacy is "one of the frequent causative conditions of the psychoneuroses of a sexual nature." He affirms that restriction upon instinct is most desirable for the individual and the race; but he condemns the system that neglects the harmonisation of tendencies with the rules of sound, healthy morality. In women this defective and false education, that attempts to inculcate ideas of the non-existence of fundamental instincts, is a frequent factor of erotic obsessions and of psychoneurotic manifestations.

These instilled repugnances, dreads, specious theories, and untruths react upon bodily function, and may cause serious derangements. Many instances are given by Dejerine and other investigators. "Grave neurasthenic conditions of all kinds" result in women, especially from the doubts, depressions, and obsessions due to ignorance of vital facts.[3]

The excess of sentimentality that affects many unmarried women produces emotional states that lead to neurasthenic symptoms, even to loss of weight and

[1] See "Marriage and Disease," a valuable symposium, edited by Prof. Senator and Dr Kaminer.

[2] "Differences in the Nervous Organisation of Men and Women," p. 88.

[3] Dr Mott has stated that "the repression of the instinct of propagation, and attendant mental dejection or excitation, is a powerful cause of mental or nervous disorders."

impairment of physical and moral health. Professor Dejerine believes that sexual preoccupations rank third in importance in the causes of psychoneuroses, and must be estimated at 22 per cent.

The psychology of celibacy has been neglected, more especially in regard to women, who, on the authority of the most eminent modern neurologists, psychopathists, and gynæcologists, are far more affected than men by the reproductive impulse and functions. "In the animal kingdom in Nature every female mates," says Balls-Headley. Only among the civilised races of mankind is the phenomenon of imposed celibate living widespread among women.

The society that is unable to solve the problem of the great unmarried should at least attempt to teach the hygiene of celibacy. Nothing systematic is essayed in this direction. Woman's clothing, diet, artificiality, indoor life, employments, and whole environment accentuate the troubles of a single life. The corset waist is the source of manifold and flagrant disabilities and organic disorders. A woman in the well-to-do orders is surrounded by emotional and sentimental stimuli that intensify her nervousness. Her ignorance exposes her to grave risk of brain shocks, leading to hysteria or neurasthenia. The conventional moral training of adolescent females is scarcely concerned with the teaching of the commonest rules of health. In the case of males, in adolescence, the conditions are hardly better. There is, in fine, no preparation whatever for the trials and the discipline of chastity. As a result, thousands of youths and maidens, through a lack of counsel and warning, grow to maturity stunted in mind or mentally perverted, and often obsessed by morbid thoughts and habits. I have never yet met any intelligent, earnest-minded man or woman who, in allusion to this fiery ordeal of youth and its after-injuries, has not lamented the ignorance in which they were reared.

It is the experience of many neurologists, alienists, psychotherapeutists, and many general practitioners, that celibates tend to closer preoccupation with sex than the married. The starving are often harassed with images of banquets and thoughts of eating. It would

be strange indeed if obsessional erotic thoughts were absent in the case of ardent and nervous celibates; because in communities free from an intense solicitude concerning the satisfaction of hunger, the sex-instinct assumes an engrossing importance. The emotional and psychic elements in this impulse exercise an enormous sway, and colour unconsciously the whole moral and mental texture. Fixation of idea in this matter is very prevalent among highly civilised races.

Incapacity is very rare as a neuropathic manifestation, "but fear of disability is very common.[1] Dejerine states that these cases are "extremely numerous," and that the psychopathic state is removed by marriage. Intense obsessions leading to acute depressions sometimes result when celibacy is prolonged. Most modern authorities concur that these trials of celibacy are immensely deepened and complicated by the sufferers' complete misunderstanding of the physical laws of life, or by total ignorance. This ignorance, as I have had occasion to remark more than once in this inquiry, is one of the menacing anomalies of our society, and a result of our imperfect moral education.

It may be necessary to repeat that in former times philosophers and theologians regarded the sex-emotion as a matter of mere function. Literature abounds with allusions to "the lower appetites," "gross desires," and "the animal passions." The attitude of the revilers of the human body and of Nature's ordinations evoked the scorn of Leonardo da Vinci. But such protest, though even uttered by a few of the more enlightened of the Christian Fathers, was unheeded during the age when men were taught to recognise sin in natural desires, and vileness and corruption in the body. Such teaching was directly hostile to the study of the body, and the knowledge of physiology has remained comparatively meagre even to this day. The range and diffusion of the sexual impulse was not suspected, though its force was dreaded. Erotic manifestations were regarded as mechanical or purely physical. Only

[1] "The Psychoneuroses and their Treatment," a valuable work by Prof. J. Dejerine (University of Paris) and Dr E. Gauchler. Eng. trans. by S. E. Jelliffe, M.D.

to-day are we beginning to apprehend the psychic significance and far-reaching range of the second of the great primary impulses.

The advocacy of celibacy as the noblest ideal of humanity would have been impossible had men realised that a universal tendency towards the non-fulfilment of the strongest passion implanted by Nature would end in the total disruption of society. Monastic hysteria, manias, perversities, and licence, so common in the Middle Ages, show how perilous is revolt against the life-force. Despite the risks of childbirth, marriage is far more favourable than celibacy to the health and longevity of women. Conjugal life in both sexes safeguards against many maladies of the body and mind. In the epidemic of meningitis in Strasbourg, in 1841, there were only nineteen married persons among ninety sufferers who died.

The physiological and psychic life of the married is obviously more normal and harmonious than that of the unmarried. There is greater resistance to disease, higher vitality, and more mental stability among the conjugal than among the celibate. The tedium of life, the melancholias, and the manias that often impel to suicide, are less frequent among the married than the unmarried. Brierre de Boisment and Falret collected very instructive figures referring to the proportion of suicides among the wedded and the single. Falret found that out of one hundred suicides, in several large towns, sixty-seven victims were unmarried. Brierre de Boismont, in a more extended inquiry, stated that out of 4595 persons who took their own lives, 2080 were celibates, 560 were widowers and widows, and 1644 married.

Georget, among 764 male lunatics, found that 492 were unmarried, 50 widowers and widows, against 201 married. Napheys says that nearly two-thirds of suicides, and in some years nearly three-fourths, are committed by celibates. The large predominance of madness and suicidal impulse in the celibates has been proved by the valuable researches of the eminent Bertillon. It is stated that throughout the civilised nations there are three or four single women to one married in insane asylums. Dr Paul Dubois states that

" there is very little ' nervousness ' in those who have no sexual disturbance." [1]

In France, judicial statistics show that among a hundred criminals sixty were unmarried. The moral advantage of the married state can be certified by other means than criminal statistics. Celibacy exposes to excesses, follies and moral aberrations. The celibate and pseudo-celibate are more egotistic, self-centred, and usually more irresponsible than the fathers and mothers of the nation. Marriage is educative and disciplinary, and as a social force its tendency is humanising and beneficent. The conjugal life is in accordance with biological law, the security of the state, social morality, and the well-being of the individual. A life without love is barren and stultifying. For love is the source and the sun of life, the inspiration, the consolation, and the guerdon of humanity.

The chances of life and of attaining vigorous old age are much higher among the married than the unmarried. Many lists of figures have been recorded, showing the mortality of the married and the celibate. Stark's record for Scotland, taken from 100,000 individuals, is as follows:

DEATHS.

	Married.	Celibate.
From 20 to 25 years . . .	597	1,174
„ 25 to 30 „ . . .	865	1,369
„ 30 to 35 „ . . .	907	1,475
„ 40 to 45 „ . . .	1,248	1,689
„ 60 to 65 „ . . .	3,385	4,330
„ 65 to 70 „ . . .	8,055	10,143
„ 80 to 85 „ . . .	17,400	19,688

These figures show the favourable influence of marriage, especially from the age of twenty to forty-five and in old age. Similar results may be found in the statistics of Casper of Berlin. Bertillon demonstrates that, in spite of the mortality of women in giving birth, the married women are less mortal than the single. The death-rate is high among females married before the age of twenty. From thirty to thirty-five, out of 1000 married women, there were nine deaths against eleven among the unmarried. After

[1] " The Psychic Treatment of Nervous Disorders."

fifty, when the dangers of maternity have passed, the deaths among wives are much less frequent than among widows and spinsters. Thus among 1000 women, aged from fifty to fifty-five, there were fifteen to sixteen deaths; while among the same number of celibate women and widows, the death-rate was twenty-six to twenty-seven.

It is estimated that by marrying a man adds five years to his life, and a woman four. When due consideration is given to the enormous mortality of women through the exercise of the reproductive function, we still recognise that conjugality preserves the life of women, and offers excellent promise of longevity. The risks and pains of motherhood are largely preventable. They are attributable in very many cases to the unhygienic lives led by women, as most gynæcologists and obstetricians have repeatedly affirmed.

When we examine the statistics of the deaths of husbands as compared with those of bachelors and widowers, we find the same beneficial influence in marriage. From twenty-five to forty the chances of life for widowers are almost three times as unfavourable as for the married. Between the ages of thirty-five and forty, deaths occur in the following proportion, among 1000 men, according to Bertillon's figures: husbands, seven and a half; celibates, thirteen; widowers, seventeen and a half.

Hygienic and medical authority concurs in the great benefit of marriage for the sex destined to bear children. It has been said that enforced celibacy is a woman's worst evil. Physiologically, man suffers less than woman from the deprivation of love and parentage; but, taking the immense differences in temperament and physique into careful account, there is extreme difficulty in setting up any rational argument for prolonged and absolute celibacy in men. What is a tolerable state for one man is torture for another. All along the evolution of modern civilised societies, we have taken it for granted that in this respect men are fairly alike, or on a norm. This primary error, which has given rise to endless misapprehensions, fallacies, and social casuistries, is slowly disappearing

from the scientific mind. The variation of impulse and virility in men is extremely marked, and the continence that is easy for one may be a constant trial and conflict for another. It may be said that the pseudo-celibacy of the larger proportion of bachelors is a twin evil with the actual positive celibacy of a host of single women. Both conditions menace the individual and the community to an incalculable degree.

The false-celibate man, who defers marriage till forty, comes to wedlock disillusioned or blasé. He has lost youth's faith, youth's altruism, youth's enthusiasm. Often his health is seriously impaired by irregular living and dissipation, or he may be incurably diseased. The longer marriage is postponed after the age of thirty, the less disposed is a bachelor for wedlock. Many men become resigned to a single existence before thirty-five, though at twenty-five they were inclined to marry.

The positively celibate man is sometimes susceptible, after many years of repression, to forms of neurasthenia, as stated by Dr Charles D. Fox in the "Psychopathology of Hysteria," by Dr Paul Dubois of Berne, Dr Brill of Columbia University, and others. We must guard against the too ready assumption that the restraints of celibacy in men invariably result in grievous injury to the brain or other organs; but we must not neglect the large mass of evidence which proves that repression, when long protracted, often leaves traces upon the nervous system, and that in some cases it is a cause of distinct neuropathic states.

Protracted male celibacy, in some recorded instances, physically debars men from wedlock, and is a source of organic disturbances, atony, and occasionally local atrophy. Such cases are recorded by various physicians in several countries.

It is in the psychic and neural spheres that the traumata of repressions are most frequent and marked. Freud, Brill, Ernest Jones, Dejerine, and other students of psychoses have provided reliable data from many hundreds of cases that they have investigated. Most, if not all, of the common anxiety-phobias in both sexes appear to be related to repressed or frustrated impulse. Often these manifestations subside and finally vanish

in a happy marriage. Anstie, one of our greatest authorities on neuralgia, remarked years ago that suppressed yearnings, often not associated in the mind with love, give rise in women to evil forms of spinal irritation, nervous disorder, and malaise.

I have given only a glimpse into a wide field of inquiry respecting the psychology of celibacy. It is scarcely necessary, in view of the vast amount of evidence in favour of marital living, that I should attempt, at greater length, to demonstrate the disadvantages of celibacy by pointing to particular resultant physical and mental penalties. To most minds it is evident that marriage is the normal mode of life. The general conclusions, derived from my own extensive observation and the study of scientific and therapeutic authorities, will be those of all thoughtful readers. But it may be necessary to emphasise the fact that the greater number of physicians regard pre-marital abstinence in youth and early manhood as quite normal and healthful.

It is clear, then, that marriage promotes sexual morality, deepens the emotions of affection, sympathy, and kindness, develops force of character by providing a stimulus to industry, sobriety, and patience, and conduces to sanity of judgment upon human nature and social affairs. It is also ascertained that conjugality preserves bodily health and mental powers, tends to increase intellectual faculty, favours longevity, lessens responsiveness to criminal or vicious impulses, and powerfully restrains the more serious forms of anxiety and depression, sometimes leading to self-destruction or dementia. Celibacy, on the other hand, fosters sexual vices and perversions, deepens self-regarding feeling, limits sympathy, checks energy, diminishes control over bad habits, restricts knowledge of men and women and of child-life, shortens the span of existence, appears to favour the development of hysterical, neurasthenic, psychasthenic, and insane obsessions, and sometimes causes specific organic injuries and disturbances, more particularly among women.

The social order tends to the frustration, or the severe suppression, of normal desires among masses of the population, and especially among women. This

tendency of a civilisation without organisation and adjustment influences and perpetually threatens national health and morals. Men who cannot mate naturally seek outlets for gratification in commercialised and degrading substitutes for marital life, which scathe the finer feelings and emotions, make social outcasts of tens of thousands of potential mothers, and spread the virus of appalling diseases throughout Christendom and in far regions inhabited by primitive people. Women thwarted from conjugal love and the supreme satisfaction of maternity, wither in mind and body, and incur numerous perils to health; while others, in revolt against a disorganised state that offers them neither marriage nor a living wage, and at best promises only an existence of monotonous and mostly unwholesome drudgery, turn to hetairism as the preferable means of livelihood. And in both sexes an enormous proportion resort to those auto-erotic practices which are always and everywhere the concomitants of abnormal sex-life, and the frequent source of hypochondriacal psychoses, depressions, and phobias.

Reviewing this civilised chaos, Professor J. A. Thomson and Professor Patrick Geddes, two biologists who approach this problem with splendid scientific preparation, grave moral sincerity, and the sympathy of poets, declare that, "The consequence of this, and in our age and civilisation perhaps especially, is not only much unhappiness, but much morbidity, disease and crime. It is for man as a rational social being, free from the inevitable tyranny of a society reared on an instinctive basis, to re-arrange his social organisation on the one hand so that there be more, not less, of normal life-opportunity for its normal members; and, on the other hand, more and more of those high opportunities of the species—regarding life in which the universality may compensate for the indirectness. Here are born Plato's children of the spirit; here, from of old, woman has had her sisterhoods, man his manifold orders and associations."[1] Abnormal repression and unnatural excess both cause undue activity of impulse. This is illustrated in the starving, whose

[1] "Problems of Sex," issued by the National Council of Public Morals, 1913.

thoughts and dreams are of food, and in the gourmand, who is continually preoccupied with the pleasures of eating and drinking. It is the same, though in a very much wider degree, with the weirdly powerful emotion of love, the most severely suppressed of human passions in complex civilisations. The experience of modern psychotherapeutists in this country, in America, and on the Continent proves that the prevalent mental disorder known as anxiety-neurosis is on the border-line of graver brain maladies, and is inevitably the result of an inharmonious amative life.

We are prone to the error of regarding eroticism as the mere expression of an animal need. The source of this deep misconception is of profound interest to biologists, and must be understood by all moral reformers before attempting to cope with sexual vices and aberrations. Our view of sex must be broadened before we can make any progress in morality and hygiene. We must come to the question with open minds and clean, honest vision, realising that all is pure to the pure. Within all of us is a force expressed in manifold powerful impulses, and for the devout theist this force represents the design of Divinity. To the reverent inquirer, this motor is apparent in the main actions of human nature; and when he speaks of "the sex-impulse," he alludes to something of profoundly deeper import than the one fundamental physical desire with which it is commonly associated, or to which many persons restrict it. Love is not simple sensuality in the connotation of the psychologist or of the poet. Eros is of the soul, the psychic, the spiritual, the moral nature of man. Erotic feeling may express itself in the worst manifestations of lust; but love can inspire to the noblest renunciations, the finest flowering of morality, the grandest of æsthetic expression, the profoundest religious devotion.

Life is the love-life. When this is recognised we are well on the way of virtuous living. When love is honoured, understood, and cherished as the mightiest of the moral dynamics, society will take heed that all of its efficient units shall possess the right of loving. "*The ignorance displayed in matters sexual is appall-*

ing."[1] This ignorance must be overcome before we can begin the initial reforms tending to the encouragement of marriage, the promotion of healthy and happy marital life, the diminution of prostitution, illegitimacy, infanticide, and the dire host of maladies of body and mind that flourish in the midst of apathy and culpable lack of knowledge.

The well-balanced, the moral, the competent life is determined by heredity, nurture, environment, and due employment of body and mind. This efficiency, as we have seen, is attained by following the biological law of mating. Experience shows that the monogamic form of sex-union is that best adapted to the needs of most advanced races. Monogamous marriage is, therefore, esteemed by millions of people as the most equitable and moral form of the sex-relationship. Yet the complexity, the disorganisation, the veritable anarchy of the higher civilisations rear enormous obstacles to this union. With each decade it is more arduous for the masses of the people to subsist, and marriage naturally becomes more difficult of attainment.

Meanwhile, through hereditary influence, increased sensitivity and responsiveness of the brain and nerves, and the growth of innumerable subtle excitants, the activity of the amorous instinct is immensely stimulated.

This is shown by the marked development of inverted forms of sexuality, amazing perversions, and the spread of venereal diseases. These growths are symptoms of widespread abnormality, and evidence of ever-increasing sexual promiscuity. From these signs there is but one conclusion: *we are a naturally monogamous people, but, owing to the numerous hindrances to wedlock, we are living in chaotic promiscuity.*

Such disorder is the biologic and historic characteristic of races on the verge of disruption. This state is sometimes likened to barbarism, but it is, in no sense, truly barbaric; for primitive communities rarely indeed afford such instances until corrupted by "higher" civilisations. It is a portent of the decadence of a cultured society that has utterly neglected one great sphere of culture-development. It is evidence of an anomalous ethic and education which, with all their

[1] "Psychanalysis," A. A. Brill, Ph.B., M.D., 1914.

numerous and conspicuous achievements in morality, science and art, have never recognised the importance of a biological and sociological study of the sexual impulse and its legitimate expression and satisfaction. All our prescriptions, mostly based on ancient codes, often outgrown and often unequal and ineffective, have been negative counsels. "Thou shalt" has not supplemented "Thou shalt not." As an outcome, there are few indeed amongst the men and women of our nation who possess even a moderate knowledge of the meaning, the range, the potentialities, the menaces, and the direct and indirect influences of the mightiest force that Nature implants in humanity. And to the few who understand the import of this force, there still remains the problem: How can I, in the midst of all this accumulated ignorance, injustice, anomaly, and morbidity, live a normal, moral, healthy love-life?

PART II

THE REMEDIES

CHAPTER XIV

WHAT ARE THE REMEDIES?

For the title of the first chapter of the second part of this volume, I have chosen the interrogation that has probably been in the minds of my readers while I have endeavoured to expose the problems of celibacy in the nations of the West. I do not presume that valid remedies are easily discovered. A matter so intricate demands the study of a large number of the ablest intellects; and it is my earnest hope that what I have written may at least serve to indicate that the anomaly is serious enough for the close reflection of sociologists, practical reformers, and humanitarians. At all events, I am sure that I have voiced the thoughts of a very large number of my compatriots.

There is no doubt that specific remedies could be applied by the legislature, by economic reforms, by the adjustment of industrial wages, and by housing schemes. In the ensuing chapters I shall bring forward suggestions of this nature. Before doing so it is necessary to consider some of the proposals that have been made from time to time by reformers who have clearly recognised the inequalities and the evils of enforced celibacy.

The methods of proposed amelioration, which appear to be impracticable, or insufficiently applicable, are: (1) polygamy as a solution of the involuntary celibacy of women; (2) Free Love; (3) the taxation of bachelors.

Polygamy as a remedy has been seriously advocated by a few earnest writers in this country. Havelock Ellis refers to a work published in 1780, and written by a distinguished Church of England clergyman named Martin Madan, which advised plural marriage on the Old Testament plan as the best means of lessening

prostitution and libertinage. "Projects of marriage reform have never since come from the Church," comments Ellis. The intrepid and zealous cleric, who had been a chaplain at the Lock Hospital, incurred theological odium, and was forced to leave London and live in the country.

James Hinton, who wrote several notable volumes, including the well-known "Mystery of Pain," affirmed that monogamy might be made more flexible in particular cases, and that indissoluble single wedlock was but one form of the sex-relationship. Hinton maintained, like the Rev. Martin Madan, that a less rigid monogamic marriage system would make prostitution unnecessary. Strictly speaking, the advocacy of "polygamy" has never been a recommendation of legally sanctioned, or religious, plural marriage, but a proposal of countenanced polygyny, a term bearing a different interpretation from polygamous marriage. This form of concubinage may be approved by a community, or it may be more or less clandestine and morally discountenanced. Polygyny, as witnessed among the Western nations, is a spurious form of polygamy, a plurality of women and not a plurality of legal wives. The maintenance of a concubine was permitted by the early Christian Church before the Council of Toledo, and that convocation decided to exonerate the unmarried man who showed fidelity to his mistress. In Wales, in ancient times, the concubine shared the home with the wife, but was excluded from equality in legal rights. Old English law recognised the concubine as legitimate up to the thirteenth century.

The Western man is not disposed to accept the obligations of polygamy. He indulges his incontinent bias in polygyny or in promiscuity. The law does not permit him to marry more than one wife. He is, however, quite free to maintain more than one mistress who, unlike her sister of bygone times in England and Wales, has no legal position, and invariably loses caste. The facilities for polygynous relations in the United Kingdom are actually greater than the facilities for the holy state of matrimony.[1] There are many outlets for the appeasement of men's polygamous craving, without

[1] See "Women under Polygamy," Walter M. Gallichan.

the burden of responsibility to Allah and the law of the country as in Islam.

In a very marked degree, the Western temper is not inclined to polygamy even as a respected, permissible state of marriage. The highest as well as the lowest human societies tend to monogamous unions. Even in polygamous countries most of the inhabitants are monogamists. Where monogamic marriage laws are stringent, exacting and unequal, and divorce costly and difficult, there is always a reaction to polygyny of the most irresponsible type. But the great mass of European people are quite opposed to sanctioned polygamy. The suggested remedy of plural marriage, as a settlement of the great question of redundant celibate women in our country, cannot be placed among practical schemes. This does not involve an ill-considered, sweeping condemnation of all oriental or primitive poygamy. Such form of marriage, as many distinguished English men and women have testified through close observation, is often suited to the needs of a people, and is sometimes biologically inevitable.

It is unnecessary to allude to polyandry as a possible remedy for the celibacy of women. Polyandrous types of women exist in all parts of the globe; but in our own society, so far as my researches go, there has never been any prescription of this kind of sexual relation as a legal institution. Illicit and secret polyandry is far from uncommon. In the hybrid form of prostitution, it flourishes in all the civilised nations. In its licit form it is practised by the Nairs of Malabar, and is said to be one of the surviving customs of the matriarchal period.

Free Love, in the sense of monogamic unions terminable at will, has been far more widely and insistently advocated than legal polygamy. The system was ardently commended by Godwin, who formed a free union with Mary Wollstonecraft, in 1796, after her previous alliance of that nature with Captain Imlay. To legitimise her child, Mary, who afterwards became the lover of Shelley, Mary Wollstonecraft urged William Godwin to a religious marriage ceremony. Shelley, the fervent disciple of Godwin, zealously protested against indissoluble marriage in the interest of morality and love.

The propaganda of Free Love, or, more accurately, reformed, dissoluble marriage, was continued with ardour by Robert Owen, a social reformer of great enthusiasm and courage. His son, Robert Dale Owen, in his book upon "Moral Physiology," reiterated the tenets outlined by his father. As the Owens were the exponents of free-marriage, and had no wish to destroy the monogamic ideal, they must not be included among the advocates of omnigamy or union *en masse*.

A pioneer of Free Love, in the anarchic sense, was the Rev. J. H. Noyes, of Yale, who, through a deep study of the Scriptures, became convinced that they taught the abolition of sexual monopoly. Noyes was, no doubt, influenced by the writings of Charles Fourier, an ardent communistic teacher, whose "Théorie des Quatre-Mouvements" contained the doctrine of omnigamous union. Fourier saw such peril in celibacy that he maintained the right of mating apart from marriage, even in the case of adolescents. The ideal of this apostle was the Phalanstery, a community holding love in common. Fourier's theories influenced a large number of minds, especially in France and America.

In the United States there were several attempts to establish communal marriage, notably that of the Oneida Creek Free Lovers, founded by J. H. Noyes. In 1849, at the time when the Owens were propagating free-marriage pleas in England, the Oneida Association issued their first report, which was in the nature of an *apologia*. It announced that "the secret history of the human heart will bear out the assertion that it is capable of loving any number of times and any number of persons, and that the more it loves, the more it can love." The personal testimony of members of the community stated that omnigamy banished jealousy, suspicion, and deception. There were no courtesans, thieves nor destitute persons in the colony. The rules of hygiene were strict, and there was but little disease.

Fourierism was eloquently expounded in America by Dr M. E. Lazarus, who pleaded for full freedom in sex-relations as an antidote against "the state of disgraceful promiscuity in the abandoned hells of our great cities." The author attempted to prove his case by Biblical quotations showing that plural union was

divinely appointed. He claimed that the "phalanx" promoted morality, placed love on a natural basis, and favoured race development. Like Charles Fourier, he regarded legal marriage as a condition of "chattelism" for women.

In spite of social and legal pressures, Free Love has made some progress in America as a propaganda. Various societies of Fourierites have arisen from time to time, and their creed has been set forth in numerous books and periodicals.

In 1895, Emil F. Rudebusch issued a plea for entire freedom in love. His book, "Free Men and Women in Love and Marriage," sold widely in America. It was a protest against all monopoly in love, either in monogamy, polygamy, or polyandry, and it may be said to present the most extreme views of sexual freedom.

In England the pleas for freedom seldom advocate drastic and highly revolutionary changes in the sex-relationship. The opponents of marriage reform are usually too ready to denounce all such reform as an outcome of a revolt against law and order in sexual affairs. Most of the criticism of the system of enforced cohabitation in monogamic wedlock is associated in the conventional view with the wildest proposals of "Free Love"; whereas the criticism is often, and indeed usually, the effort of strict monogamists to buttress and preserve monogamic marriage. A very small proportion of English people are avowedly sympathetic towards unrestrained freedom in love relations. Free Love extremists are few, and their influence has never been wide.

About twenty-five years ago a society for the advocacy of Free Love, known as the Legitimation League, held meetings, and published a periodical in London. Some of the members of the league were whole-hearted in their zeal; but the organisation had a short existence. In the midst of its activity, Grant Allen, who regarded the movement as part of "a great struggle for human freedom," stated in a letter that "the question of sexual freedom is in abeyance just now; the public still remains in its reactionary mood. . . . I can see that the pendulum is slowly swinging back again."

No deep and radical change in the direction of omnigamy need be dreaded by the orthodox supporters of the existing marriage system. Minor modifications have been made in our marriage laws from time to time, in accordance with public demand; and such reforms, though they point to flexibility, do not by any means threaten the strong superstructure of monogamous marriage. The biological bias for the monogamic union will always take care of marriage. And the facilitation of marriage, through the action of society and the law, will prove the most effective check upon the promiscuous tendency.

A critical examination of the arguments in support of "collective love" is not necessary here. The national temperament is adverse to that institution. The attitude of a large number of thoughtful men and women towards marriage reform is on another plane, and is directly antipathetic to the chaotic promiscuity that at present prevails. We may therefore dismiss Free Love as a practical remedy. Polygyny, even in its organised and sanctioned form, would not solve the problem of celibacy as it exists in the midst of our society. At the best, its influence would be merely limited and transitory.

The penalisation of bachelors through the imposition of a tax has been suggested in the past, and in current discussions upon the marriage problem after the war, the suggestion has been warmly approved. This proposal is typical of the disposition to tinker with an abnormality instead of seeking down to its source and striving to annihilate it. The reformers take it for granted that the bachelor is an anti-social individual who selfishly abstains from marriage and parentage. This is only true of a percentage of well-to-do single men. The larger proportion of bachelors are single through necessity, not from deliberate preference. Obviously it would be unjust to tax those who are already debarred, through economic reasons, from entering into matrimony. Taxing the rich bachelor would not encourage him to marry. Many men are afflicted with diseases that unfit them for marriage, and some are physically incapacitated. Before the tax could be levied an inquiry into the health and heredity of

bachelors would be necessary. An inquisition concerning health and incomes would arouse dissatisfaction and strong protest.

Taxation of celibate men is not a panacea for the decline of marriage and the birth-rate. Such a meddlesome policy is in line with other social reform methods that merely aim at making the way hard for transgressors, and leave the causes of crime untouched. The best way to diminish the number of bachelors is to adapt marriage to the present needs of the community by removing formidable hindrances to the altar.

CHAPTER XV

THE ECONOMIC REMEDY

THERE are very few suggested schemes of social amelioration that escape the laconic definitions "Utopian," "socialistic," or "revolutionary." Comfortable and inert citizens are even known to pale at the word "reform," and there are persons whose acrimony is instantly stimulated whenever anyone proposes to examine existing institutions. It is quite true that one half of the world does not know how the other half lives, and it may be added that the greater number of the favoured moiety do not care. I suppose that most intelligent men and women support the principle that all hale members of the community, willing to work, deserve a subsistence wage and decent dwelling conditions. I imagine also that most of my compatriots appraise marriage as a necessary and commendable state.

Granting, then, that every healthy adult should be able to live a normal marital existence, we may proceed to discuss means for attaining this consummation. The humane, patriotic and socially awakened employer of labour, who enjoys the comforts of life and the felicity of the family fireside, would have all his work-people in a like state. His first care is, therefore, the adequate provision of means for those whom he employs, so that they may experience his own pleasures and consolations. He cannot be content if he reflects that a number of his assistants are arbitrarily condemned to a lonely, loveless life, or that those who are wedded lack the wherewithal to maintain and nurture their children. Fortune has dealt generously with him. His heart flows out towards those whose labour has enabled

him to live in comfort, to marry, and to rear, educate, and endow a family.

Another type of commercial potentate assures the man of moral and social feeling that "sentiment is not business," and that the iron laws of trade preclude concern with the private careers of his workmen. He will argue that he pays the wages that obtain in his species of industry, and that there his responsibility ends. If his "hands" are dissatisfied they can quit his service. If a man in his employment is industrious, capable and trustworthy, there is a chance of promotion, and so forth.

Let us glance at a few facts of industrialism. "*Ninety per cent of the actual producers of wealth have no home that they can call their own beyond the end of a week.*"[1] The families living under eighteen shillings per week cannot subsist "in a state of merely physical efficiency." Among the town populations of the United Kingdom "from 25 to 30 per cent are living in poverty." The proportion in London is "30.7 per cent." *The labouring class "receive upon the average about 25 per cent less food than has been proved by scientific experts to be necessary for the maintenance of physical efficiency."*

In 1913 "the purchasing power of a labourer's wages of one pound a week was 34 per cent less than it was five years ago—that was, it was only something like fourteen shillings a week." *Of about* 8,000,000 *adult men in regular work in the United Kingdom nearly one-third earn, at full-time employment, less than twenty-five shillings a week.* The Board of Trade return for 1907 gives the wages of agricultural labourers at "eighteen shillings and fourpence per week, counting all allowances."

Half-time work, ill-health, and unemployment reduce many families to a state of starvation. "A drop of from twenty-five shillings to twelve shillings and sixpence a week involves a vastly greater sacrifice than a drop from five hundred pounds to two hundred and fifty pounds a year." Wage-earners of all classes, including an enormous number of clerks and shop assistants, pay about 50 per cent more than the rich on

[1] See "Problems of Poverty," J. A. Hobson.

several of the necessities of life, through being compelled to purchase in small quantities. Millions of necessary but unskilled or half-skilled labourers are living under a system which denies them adequate nourishment and decent shelter, and fosters disease, infant mortality, premature death of mothers, and untold suffering.

"Poverty, like most social evils," says John Stuart Mill, "exists because men follow their brute instincts without due consideration." The indigence of the many is largely the result of the gross selfishness of the few. It is true that an industry can be killed by the expenditure of an undue proportion of the capital in wages; but it is equally true that the immense profits of some businesses are made by screwing down the remuneration of workers to starvation point. High dividends often represent flagrant suffering among the toilers who are the indispensable makers of wealth. The history of industrialism abounds in the darkest evidence of the avarice and callousness of the employing and property-owning classes. Conduct to the end of providing collective comfort and happiness, which is the alleged essence of the Christian creed, is not the common rule of commercial and industrial life. It is a business axiom that, in the struggle of competition, altruism is folly.

Poverty is remediable. Political economists of the highest authority do not subscribe to the belief that want is a biological necessity, or inseparable from social conditions. No tremendous revolution should be essential for the betterment of the lot of the wage-earning class. Amelioration is a question of national policy, social wisdom, sound economics, and common sense. The evils of low wages recoil upon all of us. They react upon the wealthy who, in common decency, or from fear of public opinion, are bound to give back a part of their spoils in charity. The parasitism of the rich causes the parasitism of the poor. Sweated workers are rarely entirely independent; they are forced to seek assistance from their more fortunate relatives and friends, and from private or public charity. Modern industrialism is a terribly vicious circle. It is supposed to provide widespread subsistence, and to create new

fields of labour; but strange as it may appear, it condemns millions to poverty. No humane and reflective man can be happy in the spectacle of this pervading injustice and misery. "Since no one is responsible for having been born, no pecuniary sacrifice is too great to be made by those who have more than enough, for the purpose of securing enough to all persons already in existence."[1] And yet the first to cry out against increased taxation for the benefit of the unfortunate are invariably those who are the most fortunate. We hear almost daily of malcontent and rebellious capitalists and landowners, who spitefully withdraw doles in charity because the death dues are raised, or a few pounds added to their income-tax.

If those who possess the power, but lack the will, to pay a living wage cannot be educated to a sense of responsibility, the only alternative is State coercion. Such at least is the view of many reformers. The hostility of employers to trades unions is eloquent of their class prejudice, and an evidence of the general attitude of the "haves" to the "have nots" throughout Christendom. A minimum wage can be enforced fairly by a public official acting as arbitrator. In Australia and New Zealand such legislation has had beneficial results throughout the community.

The disfranchisement of about a third of adult men, and of several millions of adult women, gags the voice of vast numbers of the population, causes seething unrest and a sense of outlawry, and will inevitably bring about the gravest national indignation if not remedied in the near future. People are growing weary of politicians who place faith in our aptitude for "muddling through."

Another suggested specific for mitigating the poverty of wage-earners is the system of co-operation between the employer and the employed. Profit-sharing has been tried with success in many industrial and commercial undertakings. The method stimulates the capabilities and the industry of workers, improves their status, and directly benefits the employer. Antagonism between masters and men is lessened by the system, which provides an identical interest to the two classes.

[1] J. S. Mill: "Principles of Political Economy."

The workmen feel themselves capitalists on a small scale. Co-partnership between mine proprietors and miners, and factory owners and operatives has been proved successful. The Messrs Briggs, of Leeds, issued three thousand fifteen-pound shares to their work-people engaged in the Methley Colliery in 1865. This scheme was highly profitable. No disputes and strikes followed, and the miners, as well as the owners, were entirely satisfied with the result. As wealth-producing factors, co-operation and co-partnership are almost invariably successful. There is a cessation of animosity between the worker and the employer, and an increased output of labour. Only a morbid infatuation with the militant competitive ideal hinders the progress of co-operation in this country. The shrewdest capitalists recognise its merits after a fair trial.

Development of the resources of the soil, and the cultivation of unreclaimed tracts, would stimulate earlier and more frequent marriage. The neglect of agriculture, small culture, and intensive culture in the United Kingdom is deplorable. Years ago William Howitt described the prosperity of the German peasant proprietors: "The German peasants work hard, but they have no actual want. . . . He is his own master; and he, and every member of his family, have the strongest motives to labour. . . . This country is, in fact, for the most part in the hands of the people."

In Norway the small landed proprietor is prosperous and contented. Belgium, Holland and France afford the surest proof of the success of peasant proprietorship. The small agriculturists of these countries far excel us in intelligent and profitable cultivation of the earth. The poorest land is made productive by the labours of these free men, each one working in his own interest, and taking pride and pleasure in his toil.

In Switzerland the combination of peasants in cheese-making is a source of wealth. Flemish farmers contrive to raise crops from reclaimed sandhills by first growing broom which is sold as fuel. The ground is then sown with rye, and afterwards assiduously manured until it is changed in character and made profitably productive. There are vast tracts of land in the United Kingdom, ten times as potentially fertile

as these sandhills, that could be cultivated and made to provide food, and ultimately a living for thousands of people. Long before the farmers of England understood the value of the rotation of crops and the use of suitable manures, the peasants of the Continent had, by these means, developed a great industry and accumulated capital. Wherever you wander in our country you will see waste land, neglected fields, endless acres of unpruned and untended fruit trees, weed-grown corners, and uncultivated, abandoned gardens. Yet it is known that a Belgian farmer and his family can live on six acres of moderately fertile land.

The chief hindrances to the development of small farming in the United Kingdom are insecurity of tenure, excessive rents, and the reluctance of landowners to allot small acreages of their estates. We lament the decline of agriculture; but we drive men from the land.

In the island of Jersey there is a cultivator to about every eleven acres of land. Sixty years ago wheat yielded forty bushels to the acre in this island, the highest average for the whole of England being then thirty bushels. The soil is not remarkably fertile by nature; it is like that of most parts of Southern England. Nor is the climate of the Channel Islands more favourable than that of England. The results come from constant care, and especially from judicious and plentiful use of manures. High rents have not deterred the enterprise of the farmers of Jersey; for, years ago, quite ordinary land let for four pounds an acre.

Security of possession in land is a *sine qua non* of successful cultivation. The small farm, owned by the husbandman, is always more productive than the farm that is rented. To stimulate agriculture, tenants of farms must be assured that rent will be stable, and that the fruits of his intelligence and toil will not be taxed by the proprietor of the land. J. S. Mill pointed out that landlords are not disposed to encourage agricultural improvements. "It is admitted that whatever permanently reduces the price of produce diminishes rent; and it is quite in accordance with common notions to suppose that if, by the increased productiveness of land, less land were required for cultivation, its value,

like that of any other article for which the demand had diminished, would fail."

At present the chance of attaining to proprietorship of the soil is very remote for the poor man. He can only hope to secure a holding at a moderate rent, and become a peasant tenant. If he is conscious, in the midst of his conquest of a heavy clay or a thin soil that, in a few years' time, his perseverance will be rewarded by a raising of his rent, he is naturally disheartened. He realises that he is simply improving the soil for the benefit of the already fortunate owner of the land. Small farming is, therefore, a discouraging occupation, unless the tenant is secured against an increase of rent by a long lease.

The great sacrifice of men in the war that is raging while I write these pages, has caused concern in many minds as to the means for making up the deficiency of males of the marriageable age, and increasing the population of the near future. Besides the taxation of bachelors, several measures have been promulgated in the Press. Dr Duncan Forbes, medical officer of health for Brighton, has put forward "a scheme for paying substantial bonuses to those who are willing to do their duty to the State by raising good-sized families. Dr Forbes recommended the collection of 25 per cent of all incomes, the sum collected to be redistributed according to the number of children or relations supported."[1]

This proposal will appear both equitable and practicable to many persons; while to others, already in secret revolt against existing taxations, it will seem a burden. A singularly numerous class of self-styled patriots always resist tenaciously any scheme of national well-being that touches their purses. Many suggestions of State encouragement and State aid of motherhood have been made during recent years; and the Insurance Act, by the provision of maternity grants, shows the trend of public opinion in this matter.

If it is imperative to increase the population at the present time, we must either assist the mothers of the wage-earning class out of State funds, or raise the rate of wages in many employments. Thrifty and intelli-

[1] *Daily Mail*, Sept. 25th, 1915.

gent people will not marry and produce "good-sized families," if this involves an unceasing struggle to procure the very barest necessities of life. The urging to procreation must be accompanied by some economic measures for the protection of families against want.

The communal, municipal, or group nursery for the rearing of children might be adopted in particular cases. This scheme has been advocated by zealous apostles of the economic independence of women as a method of releasing married women who desire to support themselves by labour outside of the home. I am disposed to agree with Ellen Key that the State care of children is certainly better than parental neglect,[1] accidental or culpable; but the more excellent way would be to set about lessening the causes of poverty—which result in involuntary neglect—and in widespread education in the duties of parentage. "When the formation of a home has become a science and an art," as Ellen Key affirms, there will be fewer indifferent or criminally neglectful parents. Much may be said against the moral disadvantages of many homes; but family life, ordered with reason and love, is a school of social education.

Miss Betham-Edwards, *Officier de l'Instruction Publique de France*, writing in the London *Weekly Dispatch*, praises the French system of arranged marriages. The daughters of the middle-class in France are provided with the initial sum of a dowry at baptism, and the amount is increased annually. "The marriage contract of a gamekeeper's daughter is drawn up with no less care than that of a millionaire's heiress." Undoubtedly, the *dot* gives a sense of independence to brides, and proves an assistance to the newly married pair at the outset of matrimony. It is evident, too, that marriage among our French neighbours and allies compares very favourably with our own marriages, even if it is not universally more harmonious, as several observers assert. There is now in England some indication that the *dot* system is becoming a practice among those parents who purchase endowment for daughters by insurance.

The problem of rents and housing comes fitly under

[1] "Love and Marriage."

economic remedies. Of the many factors militating against marriage and the reproduction of offspring in the vigour of life, exorbitant rents and the widespread and increasing house-famine rank among the most formidable and grave. Not only is there a terrible scarcity of *room*, but the cost of the worst kind of tenement-dwelling is vastly out of proportion to the earnings of the occupants. The official accounts of overcrowding, scarcity of dwelling accommodation in town and country, and the unwholesome character of the dens and hovels in which masses of our compatriots are herded, are simply appalling, and form a black indictment of our morality. Almost half of the nation, as stated by Professor Patrick Geddes and Professor J. A. Thomson, live in an overcrowded state.

The supply of moderately decent dwellings for the working-class is alarmingly inadequate. Various schemes of betterment are afloat; but the working is slow indeed, and almost hopelessly tangled in red-tape. The Urban Report of the Land Inquiry Committee, 1914, shows that slum property in many towns is extensive. Birmingham had, in 1912, "926 houses represented as unfit for human habitation." The number of one-room tenements inhabited by families in Glasgow is "appalling."[1] In Oldham houses are so scarce that "newly married couples resort to the expedient of buying over a tenant's head." High Wycombe has a great scarcity of houses at rentals from four shillings and threepence to six shillings a week, suitable for working people. Many persons in the town cannot marry because they cannot find a home. In Nuneaton "many young people cannot marry."

Plymouth, Stonehouse and Devonport require "ten thousand four-roomed and five-roomed cottages at five shillings and six shillings and sixpence per week respectively." Rochdale needs from one and a half to two thousand houses. *The overcrowded and defective slum dwellings are inhabited in most cases by hard-working persons in regular employment, but earning wages that entirely preclude the payment of higher rents.* In the Report of the Land Inquiry Committee it is stated that the time is now "for the nation

[1] "Year Book of Social Progress," 1913-14.

seriously to consider the problem of low wages, and to deal with it in a broad and liberal spirit." The Committee urge that the Government should fix the minimum wage for urban workers at a "sum necessary to maintain a family of moderate size in a state of physical efficiency, to enable them to pay an economic or commercial rent for a sanitary dwelling." The fixation of wages by legislation has now come within the field of practical politics.

The Rural Housing and Sanitation Association state, in the eleventh annual report, that the difficulties in providing cottages are "still formidable, and call for earnest and united effort." The Association points out that the rent difficulty is the result of low wages. Although the labourers' wages had risen nearly 10 per cent between the years 1896-1911, *the cost of living has also risen so much as to make the increase apparent rather than real.* In almost every quarter of the United Kingdom there is a scarcity of houses rented at from ten to fifteen pounds a year. A personal inquiry in South Wales and the West of England, during 1915, proved that the demand for such houses is very great. Very few new cottages are being built. In many of the villages, and especially in mining districts, there is excessive overcrowding.

The responsibility of housing the people must fall upon public authorities, if local landlords are unwilling to build cottages. Taxation of houses is one of the deterrents to the erection of dwellings of the class most in demand. There cannot be a high profit on house property bearing rentals of from five to eight shillings a week; and when rates are high, builders will not adventure their money.

The Land Committee show by tables that "*the poorer a man is, the greater is the proportion of his income which he spends upon rent.*" Slum landlords would seize upon the granting of a minimum wage as a pretext for screwing more out of tenants. At the first hint of a slight increase of wages among the poor, rents are raised. The largely fictitious "prosperity" of the working-class during the present war was immediately made an excuse for extorting higher rents. This extortion has been violently resisted in

Glasgow, Birkenhead, Birmingham, and the poorer parts of the Metropolis.

In many quarters of the kingdom, landowners stubbornly refuse to sell land to builders for the erection of cottages. The political views of applicants for land are sometimes given as the cause of such refusal. Some districts remain thinly populated and poverty-stricken, simply through the disinclination of landlords to sell plots for the building of works and workmen's cottages. Where the whole of the land is owned by one or two owners, who refuse to sell, the situation is hopeless.

Often when public authorities wish to negotiate for the purchase of building sites, they are forced to resort to subterfuge, because the price demanded by landowners, from corporate bodies, is exorbitant. The late Mr Arthur Chamberlain, of the Kynoch Company, was asked five hundred pounds per acre for land getting a rental of one pound per annum, when he wished to provide housing accomodation for two thousand work-people. The price was impossible, and the scheme had to be abandoned.

All anti-social resistances to marriage, such as low wages, scarcity of dwellings, and disproportionate rents and rates, could be checked by an awakening of the public conscience of those who own the power, the land and its resources, and the capital. History convinces that the privileged class is always more careful of the interests of its caste than of the general well-being of the community. Hence the necessity for coercive legislation. When nobility and wealth forget the principle of obligation to neighbours, there is no course but the intervention of the State. The failure of ethics involves the substitution of legal force. In thirty-seven years of the reign of George III., 2,804,197 acres of land were "enclosed," that is to say appropriated by a few affluent families. The same acquisitive spirit is manifested to-day by landlords who refuse to sell even a corner of their estates for the erection of homes for the overcrowded and the houseless.

The number of persons living in slums is estimated at nearly three millions. These rookeries are not chiefly inhabited by the criminal class and the idle.

They are the homes of vast numbers of hard-working, honest people. The habitual criminal is better off and better housed. A labourer in West Ham, earning twenty shillings a week, spends 43.3 per cent of his income in rent. If he lives in Reading, he pays about 38.2 per cent, and in York about 29 per cent. Those who are interested in this burning question should refer to the "Journal of the Royal Statistical Society," June, 1913, in which they will find the result of a careful inquiry made by Professor A. L. Bowley. The slums of the United Kingdom are the chief breeding-places of tuberculosis.[1] They are often owned by wealthy landlords of avowed piety and untarnished respectability.

I have referred to the living-in system in the great stores and shops of the cities as one of the checks on marriage. The provision of lodging and board for assistants doubtless serves the purposes of employers, but it deprives a great number of adults of both sexes from home life. The general room and the sleeping cubicle do not constitute "an Englishman's home." There are many disadvantages in the living-in system, and it would be well if it ceased.

We may now summarise the suggested economic remedies as (1) the raising of wages to a minimum standard for the adequate support of the parents and a moderate family; (2) provision of a large number of cheap and sanitary houses in town and country; (3) the encouragement of small farming and rural life; (4) the introduction of the endowment of daughters for marriage; (5) the granting of bonuses to parents who are willing to raise good-sized families.

Our foes, confronted by the wastage of war, are already discussing State-aided marriage and maternity:

"Still another public meeting has been held in Berlin to wrestle with the truly vital problem of 'race perpetuation' consequent upon Germany's unceasingly heavy losses in the war. All speakers agreed that radical remedial measures are called for. Dr Christian, a well-known military surgeon, was

[1] Sir Victor Horsley stated to the Royal Commission on Venereal Disease, 1914, that low wages cause prostitution, and that illegitimacy and venereal disease are due largely to overcrowding.

inclined to take an optimistic view. He did not think that German population within twenty years following the war would reveal a decrease of more than 2,800,000. He saw danger only in the growth of the 'one-child and two-child family system.'

"Dr Christian opposed all suggestions of solving the baby problem by encouragement of illegitimacy, polygamy, and the like, and recommended instead a vigorous Government 'matrimonial policy.' This should encourage men to marry young and enable working women and girls to marry without giving up their occupation, perhaps by inaugurating 'half days' for working wives. Dr Christian also recommended some form of State aid for parents with many children." [1]

---

[1] *Daily Mail*, Oct. 30th, 1915.

CHAPTER XVI

THE SOCIAL REMEDY

We often hear that marriage has fallen into disfavour or discredit through reasons other than economic or legal. Celibate men and women point to instances of marital unhappiness among their friends and neighbours, and console themselves for immunity from domestic discord and strife. Cynics sneer at wedlock, and set a fashion in contemning and underrating love, which provides a constant theme for jesting and banal generalisations. We are told that "marriage is the tomb of love," and many of us accept the bitter aphorism as a profound truth, unregardful of the fact that opposite testimony is abundant. There is no way of escape from the difficulties and trials of life, but the stress and the suffering can be lightened by living in harmony with Nature. "Marriage has many pains," said Dr Johnson, "but celibacy has no pleasures."

Many girls are reared in the false belief that it is modest and becoming to avow indifference to love and marriage. This is a repudiation of life itself. We are born to love, and revolt against love is a sign of degeneration. Many youths are afraid to profess a desire for love, because the expression of this natural yearning often exposes them to foolish ridicule. Hence, in both sexes, the strongest cravings of the heart and the most potent impulses are forced out of the conscious into the subconscious, or the unconscious, and often become repressions of a morbid type. Few of us indeed are free from these repressions, which assume various characters in the unconscious self, that we erroneously dissociate from love. For this impulse is never entirely annihilated. It is hydra-headed and

intensely tenacious of life. The sane acceptation and understanding of this power make necessary control more possible. That is why love should be frankly encountered, considered, and finely sublimated. Derision, obscene levity, cynicism, prudery, harsh and spurious moralisations, reticence, and false shame tend continually, in our inverted state of mind, to drive healthy natural feeling into the remote and dark corners of the psyche.

Love and marriage should be esteemed as the destiny of all. Universally, work is beatified as the end of existence, whereas it is merely a necessity of subsistence. Marriage should be regarded as of no less importance than labour. The generation of vigorous life is of higher import than the accumulation of money. Men seek happiness through strenuous pursuit of money, and miss the bounteous joys that are theirs for the grasping. We counsel the young to find happiness in work, but rarely in love and marriage. The communities self-enslaved by a frenzy of money-getting, involving the absorption of all vital energy, not only undervalue love, but lose the inclination and the art of loving. In other words, "speeding up" in business, ever-increasing ambition to possess material things, and the emotional and spiritual starvation that accompanies this insanity, destroy the capacity for feeling and bestowing love. The work-maddened crowd becomes dead to all the exquisite raptures of the soul. The art of living is lost. Men are transformed into machines. Nervous disease increases, the craving for narcotics and stimulants grows, and it is rare, in the cities, that one finds men and women who are not constantly depressed by worry.

There is no question that intemperance in work, as instanced to-day in America and Great Britain, is inimical to love and to marriage in the best years of life. A due intervention of idleness is necessary for love. In the southern countries, where love is esteemed as the concomitant, or the daily benison, of labour, men and women have time to love and marry. We do not even recognise love as a finer passion than money-greed. It is a kind of luxury, or pleasant pastime, for the sentimentally minded. Love is so undervalued as

a source of happiness, a means of grace, and a completion of being, that many men would sooner work to keep a motor-car than to marry.

The disrepute into which marriage tends to sink in a commercialised society must be counteracted by education in the art of life and the attainment of happiness. No one will assert that content and felicity are characteristic of our community. We do not find the golden key to happiness in "speeding up," "hustling," and striving to get more. The weary, nerve-harassed, prematurely aged city man, whom we meet daily, is not a lovely symbol of joy. Generally speaking, he is a hypochondriacal neurasthenic, with a pessimistic outlook, a worried countenance, and worn-out arteries.

The encouragement of marriage must begin with a new valuation of love. Scarcely one person in ten has a conception of the meaning and the importance of the love of the sexes in the vast scheme of life. Strange as it may seem, there is more ignorance concerning this instinct than any other human impulse. It is, however, not a difficult matter to seek down to the obscure source of this ignorance. When we reflect that the simple mention of love in a company of our friends almost invariably arouses such perturbation as nervous laughter, timid, half-disdainful smiles, a joke, uneasiness, bashfulness, and sometimes a blush, we have a clue to the enigma. Of all the human passions love is the most suppressed. Rarely indeed is it permitted the full light of day, the sunshine of sympathetic, sincere confidence, the relief of expression. From our earliest years we are inhibited from wholesome inquiry, from candid speech, and from clean understanding. Too often we learn of sex in childhood from polluted sources. False shame is bred in us; the upas tree of morbid fears, complexes, and appalling misunderstanding flourishes in adolescence. When we should revere and wonder, we giggle. All sane knowledge of love has been suppressed in us. We are ashamed, and we show it.

Marriage and parentage will never attain true dignity and purity in the minds of men and women till we learn to value love as sacred. The advocacy of marriage as the best way of living must begin with a serious

education of the young in Nature's means for the continuance of life in the vegetable and animal kingdom, the structure of the human body, and the laws of health. Such training is counselled by the very highest medical and cultured lay authority in all the advanced nations. Sir Victor Horsley strongly recommended the teaching of sexual hygiene to the young during his examination before the Royal Commission on Venereal Disease. Sir Thomas Barlow advocated the teaching of physiology, and said that children learn the facts of sex "in the very worst way." Dr Helen Wilson stated that a lady with marriageable daughters forbade them attending a botany class, "because they would learn about fertilisation." Years ago Sir James Paget in his "Clinical Lectures," deplored the ignorance of sexual matters, and advised necessary instruction. In 1894 Thomas Hardy, Sir W. Besant, Hall Caine, Miss Willard, and other notable English men and women, expressed themselves in favour of such teaching among the young.[1] This movement is gaining adherents among the thoughtful of all civilised nations.

If respect for love, sex, and reproduction was inculcated, the minds of adolescents would develop normally, and marriage would be desired as the crowning of mature life. The aberrations and vices of early adolescence and manhood would be diminished, and a beneficent force would be preserved instead of being dissipated in follies, or thrown back into psychic recesses to grow morbidly. Every mother should teach her young children the blessedness and the sanctity of love, and direct them in the sublimation of imperious instincts as they approach the adult period. Unfortunately, the mass of parents of both sexes are ill-equipped for this task. But it should not be difficult for a loving mother to rear her sons and daughters in a higher, nobler appraisement of love than the vulgar, distorted, and tarnished conception that is so common among coarse and ill-educated minds in every class of society.

Conjoined with reverence for marital love, there should be an uplifting of the fine ideals of life. Material success too frequently spells intellectual and spiritual

[1] *New Review*, June, 1894.

atrophy. Many dead souls haunt the ways of men, the ghosts of men and women once attuned to love and life, rich in the things that do not count, but lacking the exquisite things that money cannot secure. A great stimulus to marriage at the suitable age would be the simplification of life, not for reasons of parsimony, or through ascetic fanaticism, but for the deepening, the expansion, and the adornment of living. Slavish worship of acquisition and possession stands in the way of a realisation of life. Men and women must choose between Eros and the God of Lucre. If we live for love, we cannot live for money as well. Love demands its hard and often painful endeavour, but its guerdon is imperishable. A mansion clattered with costly furniture and gewgaws is not necessary for the enjoyment of an ideal married life.

Fortunately, the poorest among us have not been robbed entirely of the supreme happiness of love. One need not be rich in order to secure a mate and a home. Better the reckless marriage of two fervent lovers than the cold prudence and the cowardice that defer union until the striving to accumulate means has banished the fresh ardour of vigorous manhood.

Simplifying life does not require a sacrifice of essential material objects. Nor is the process synonymous with a rejection of things valuable and beautiful in the highest sense. There are freedoms and privileges that fate cannot deny. Beauty is all around us. The sun shines on all, and the lark and the thrush sing to the just and the unjust, the rich and the poor alike. The simplest livers are usually the richest in the rarest pleasures of life. The difficulty is that we have been taught that it is difficult to live simply. We are taught that happiness consists in accumulating and collecting together all manner of superfluities, mostly worthless yet costly. We are also enjoined not to lay up treasures. These contradictory rules may be reconciled and adjusted. The treasures to aim for are those of the spirit, the emotions, the mind. Thoreau was happy in his hut at Walden Pond because, though he lacked nearly all those things that are supposed to bring satisfaction, he was free from the tyranny of desire for specious possessions. He had abundant leisure for his pursuits,

time for meditation, for the enjoyment of the lavish delights of Nature, and for study. This secluded existence is not the finest mode of living; but Thoreau's experiment was an example of how little a philosophic man really needs to attain content. "I think that there is nothing," he cries, "not even crime, more opposed to poetry, to philosophy, aye, to life itself, than this incessant business."

If a young man chooses to be driven body and soul by his business, and thinks that this tyranny is the most enjoyable kind of life, well and good. Let him "speed up" until he resembles a locomotive. But he need not be astonished if he finds at forty that love and other benedictions and graces of life are not for him.

I know a man who, through capacity, industry, and shrewdness, rose from the position of office boy to the directorship of a large business. At the age of sixty he had won a liberal share of the necessities and luxuries of life. His family urged him to retire, and to spend his remaining years in leisured enjoyment of his fortune. He assented, and for a few months he tried to live without definite occupation. Depression soon assailed him, as it assails the inebriate who abandons drink. He had become so habituated to "speeding up," unceasing intemperate energy, and concentration on one interest alone, that he could do nothing else but "speed up." Without the excitement and the stimulation of constant attention to the one activity in which he excelled, life now became intolerable. He sought for a new sphere of business activity, found it, and suffered some heavy financial losses which brought anxiety.

This is a typical instance of the limitation of the powers of the mind to a single object, or monoideism. The phenomenon is quite common in commercial societies. It is a mild form of monomania. An analysis of my friend's case shows that his dominant ambition was to "get on," or, in other words, to gain power and possessions. It is well known that excessive toil produces toxins that affect the organism. These poisons are devitalising; they may not inhibit the specific energy, but they are hostile to a number of other activities of the mind, such as sound reflection upon the greater problems of life, intellectual culture,

æsthetic appreciation, and the enjoyment of hobbies and recreations. Like many men of this order, my friend often suffered from nervous exhaustion and extreme fatigue. To relieve these frequent symptoms he took alcoholic stimulants. The temptation to drink is very keen in our strenuous, intensely competitive commercial life; and the ultimate effect of alcohol is a still further vitiation of the cerebral and nervous organisation, leading to impairment of the intellectual, and often of the moral faculties.

Our subject might have found relief and recuperation in outdoor sports, in rural holidays, and in reading or playgoing, but before middle age he had quite lost the capacity for recreation. In his youth he refrained from play, because it interfered with work and used up energy. He drilled himself into an orderly automaton. The one idea possessed him. Life to him meant "getting on," and he certainly got on; but in the process he lost almost everything worth having. He married because marriage is customary and respectable. Every business man should own a wife, and a home where he can entertain business acquaintances, etc. Even in his affairs of the heart, he was methodical, scrupulous, and business-like. His monoideism excluded great passions. All his emotions were suppressed, driven in, and timidly hunted out of consciousness. He could not hinder his time with the enjoyment of beautiful things that lure the mind from business. The fixed idea absorbed the whole of his thinking capacity, and he lost aptitude for thinking about any other topic.

This is a true picture of the restricting and stultifying influence of a fanatical devotion to work, undertaken from a deep-rooted idea that work should be a man's master instead of his servant. My friend did not toil and wear himself out to attain ease, but he worked to work. Life had no other meaning for him save business. When leisure was within his attainment he had no use for it. He might have enlarged his mind and benefited his health by travel. He had the opportunity for study, for inquiry, for a host of enjoyable activities of mind, but his life of unceasing work left him supine to everything except work itself. In a

popular text-book of the art of getting on, my typical successful man of business would be held up as a model for youth. There are some of us who would rather contemplate a total commercial failure of our sons than watch them succeed as stunted, atrophied commercial monoideists.

I have not attempted to argue that nutrition and reproduction are possible in a state of idleness. Inertia is not a normal state. The rich are not invariably lazy by choice. The muscles and the mind call for activity, and prolonged deprivation of their exercise is painful. But there is necessary, wholesome, beneficial labour, and there is unnecessary, unwholesome and maleficent employment The lessening of all factitious toil, in order to release men for love, culture, relaxation and social intercourse, will be one of the great reforms of the future. This is not " Utopian "; it must come of sheer necessity and social evolution. Society will emerge from its present chaos when such a state is no longer tolerable for the mass.

Work is not only imperative for providing food and opportunity for reproduction, but it is an indispensable factor of the healthy enjoyment of life. The thoughtless moralisers who dread widespread indolence know nothing of biologic law. They imagine that the bulk of mankind incline naturally to inactivity, a delusion without any data in anthropology, or evidence in everyday life. Human beings voluntarily seek occupation; but as civilised communities are constituted, very many are forced into unrelieved, irksome and depressing forms of labour for the benefit of those who, through inheritance of land or property, or through commercial gambling, are able to work or idle at will. The assertion, uttered daily by the comfortable and employing class, that " the working-man is lazy," is a shameful lie. The wage-earners cannot be idle; nor do the vast majority desire idleness. When a large number of children of the working-class, attending the elementary schools in the United States, were asked to write down what they wished to do when grown up, the majority stated that *they wished to work and to give their money to father and mother.*[1]

[1] " Adolescence," Principal Stanley Hall.

It has been said that the simplification of life would probably cause a lowering of wages. It is true that a lowering of the standard of positive needs among the employed gives the chance to the employer to reduce the price of hire. We have instances of this in the undercutting of alien immigrant labourers' wages. To simplify living does not mean that men should reduce the standard of living, and undervalue their labour. Man does not live by bread alone. Economy in rent, food and clothing must be supplemented by higher expenditure in the things that beautify existence. In this matter each one will be persuaded according to his predilections and tastes. One man is content with the plainest diet, if he can buy books; another economises to purchase flowers for his garden, or to take his family on a holiday. Any thriftiness and prudence that lower the wage-earning value must be deprecated. A clerk will say: "I do not need green peas out of season, and I can dispense with caviare; but my wife and I are passionately fond of music, and our standard of living demands that we shall be able occasionally to buy concert tickets."

Accepting the law of supply and demand, a young shop assistant or clerk may assure himself that his income will never exceed two hundred pounds a year. He is by nature affectionate and conjugal, and he has found a companion who is willing to undertake the burden of housekeeping, to incur the risks of motherhood, and to make the best use of a very limited income. Many of his prudent acquaintances will warn him that he is tempting fate; but one or two happily married friends may even encourage him to marry.

Paolo Mantegazza says that "marriage is often impossible and always difficult." Nevertheless, he counsels marriage with fervour, believing that the conjugal relation "can and ought to grow continually better and increase human happiness." Wise thinkers have forecasted an era when ambition will give way to love as the chief incentive to the exertion of faculties Philosophers, poets, soldiers, men of action and statesmen have testified that family love was above all else essential to their happiness. Millions of men and women share this deep yearning for marriage, but

many lack the courage to combat the difficulties that modern life opposes to wedlock.

The shadow of life is often mistaken for the substance. If the gratification of a money-lust, the possession of property, land, and factories, were the chief means of attaining felicity, then all the prosperous and the rich would be superabundantly happy. Yet the affluent are, for the greater part, unhappy. Many of this class are innately incapable of the rarest kinds of enjoyment. They are prone to ennui, the tedium of life, depression, dyspepsia, and neurasthenia. Being monoideists they have a paucity of interests, which induces boredom and diminishes the zest of life. They are often fat, and when fat invades the mind a man is lost. Frequently they are debarred from sensuous pleasure through the specific diseases that attack the overfed.

The primary essentials of happiness are health, food and shelter, the love of the sexes, and parental affection. Civilisation depends upon these human satisfactions; but our civilisation debars a multitude from some of these, and even denies all of them to a mass of people. The millions living on the hunger-line, and the great number of paupers supported by the State, prove the failure of civilisation. We blame the improvidence of the poor. If the poor were prudent and provident, they would not marry at all, and in a few generations there would be no soldiers or sailors, and no mechanics and labourers. Improvident marriage in all the underpaid classes of the country maintains the population of workers; but population produced under such conditions implies deterioration, fills the hospitals and workhouses, and is a menace to the general well-being.

There is at present no alternative to the recommendation of improvident marriage if, as many publicists insist, it is necessary to keep up the population figures. A man who marries on a wage of thirty shillings a week is not an economically cautious person, though he is obeying a law of Nature, and doing his duty to the community. A man who takes a wife when he is earning only a pound a week is quite reckless; but he is living as Nature directs, and helping to raise the birth-rate. From one point of view this man is a better

citizen than the middle-class man who shirks marriage and procreation on the plea of impecuniosity, or the man who voluntarily limits his family for personal economic reasons.

Therefore, in counselling wedlock to a vast number of the inhabitants of the United Kingdom, we are placed in a dilemma. No marriage can be really provident when the means of livelihood are precarious and the wages insufficient. Until a drastic reconstruction brings amelioration, the only course is to lessen the inevitable improvidence. This may be done by the practical training of girls in domestic management, cooking, the care of health, and the hygiene of motherhood and infant rearing. Such instruction must be thorough, and the Government should not stint the necessary funds. Tables of the dietetic value of various foods should be carefully made and widely distributed among the wage-earning classes.

In the ranks of the lower middle class, a large number of women are deplorably inefficient in housekeeping, cookery, and needlework. The "domesticated woman" of fifty years ago is almost rare to-day. No doubt this neglect of the domestic arts is the inevitable result of women's exodus from the kitchen to the shop and the office. There is, however, no reason why even the busy wage-earning girl should be entirely ignorant of plain cooking and household management. This incapacity on the part of women is often cited as one of the causes that discourage young men from marriage. The would-be benedict reflects that only a capable and careful wife will be able to make the most of his very small income. If he is of the provident order, he takes alarm when he notes the monetary anxieties and the discomforts that attend love in a cottage, when the housewife is inexperienced and wasteful.

Many girls of a marriageable age have artificial standards of comfort that deter from marriage with a poor man. I am not an advocate of the lowering of standards of living, but we often set up specious standards in youth. We think that material objects ensure happiness, and that comfort is only securable by means of possessions. In later life we learn that the

choicest pleasures cost little, or nothing at all. The only thing that counts in wedlock is love. We may find love in a wooden hut, and fail to find it, for all our seeking, in a castle. Love makes the home, not furniture and ornaments.

Girls should be educated for marriage as boys are trained for labour or business. Housekeeping is a really difficult art. Only the few excel in it. A skilful housewife is undoubtedly one of the most useful members of the community, and should be honoured for splendid services. Throughout human evolution and the history of societies, women have toiled, patiently and assiduously in the kitchen, without just recognition and reward for their great share in civilisation.

Snobbish ideals of respectability and gentility, and the love of ostentation, lead to the postponement of wedlock. The "establishment" assumes a higher value than love itself. Our perverted standards demand surroundings that are considered "genteel" or "fashionable." To appease this arbitrary, factitious need, we nearly all tend to live beyond our incomes. The tyranny of the passion for display is tremendous, and escape from it is difficult. A man will burden himself with debt to appear better off than his neighbours. A woman will starve herself to anæmia to buy finery. This self-imposed suffering is common. The woman who attaches more importance to display and parade than to the love of a husband and children should marry the man who ranks property higher than love. It may be said, however, that if all lovers were of this mould, the race would deteriorate and disintegrate. The demand and the quest for love is one of the chief manifestations of a vigorous vitality. Indifference to love is a sign of decay. Art in all stages represents the lover as adventurous, valorous, and abundantly vital.

A vast conflict of nations, so extended that it is almost universal, has forced upon our attention the question of marriage and the family in the future. Millions of men all over Europe, and in far-distant lands, have been slain in the vigour of life. When the strife is over, there will be fewer men, and therefore

more celibate women. Other nations engaged in the war are already considering plans of action.[1] What will England do? We cannot equalise the proportion of the sexes by Acts of Parliament. Science still seeks for the causes that determine sex, and we cannot hope to repair the deficiency of males in a few years. All that we can do is to foster hygienic marriage in every possible way, and, if necessary, by way of rewards and subsidies. This is not only imperative for the increasing of the population, but it is essential for the integrity and moral and physical welfare of the nation.

The conventional status of marriage is so repellent to a growing number of educated and independent-minded women, that many develop misandry, and resolve to live singly; while a proportion decide that Free Love is the only tolerable form of the sexual relationship. Ordinary marriage often implies to the wife a submergence of personality, the relinquishment even of the right to her own body, a state of pecuniary servitude, and a life of continual sacrifice. Society and the law approve the chattel-ownership of wives, in so far as they raise no protest against the gross injustice that debars married women from the right to refuse cohabitation with a criminal, a diseased, half-demented, or drunken husband. A wife must submit to the desire of a husband whom she loathes, and whose co-operation in the production of children revolts her natural instincts, her maternal feeling, and her moral sense. Social opinion offers her no protection, and the law affords no alternative, unless the husband is technically guilty of neglect or cruelty.

The woman who leaves her husband has a questionable and inequitable status. She is neither wife nor widow, and society reprobates her conduct if she forms an irregular union. The penalties for asserting a woman's right to own herself are so severe that few wives have the courage to endure them. Often solicitude for the children is a powerful deterrent to separation; and frequently poverty is a formidable hindrance.

[1] The Russians have already taken precautions against depopulation. The Minister of Justice announces that girls under sixteen may marry by applying to a magistrate. This measure is to encourage young marriages. I have referred in another chapter to the disadvantages of the marriage of minors.

Marriage reformers in all countries have repeatedly exposed this injustice. Wedlock is often a prolonged rape. This terrible fact is only too well known among medical practitioners and divorce-court lawyers. Need we wonder that refined, self-respecting women often evince a horror of marriage?

Men's universal ignorance of women's psychic and physical nature is the source of incalculable misery in connubial life. This fact cannot be reiterated too often. I do not assume that the majority of my sex are innately brutal and selfish; but I contend that the average man takes no pains whatever to learn the secondary sexual characters that distinguish woman from man. Men are wont to generalise concerning women, with a dogmatism that is quite unpardonable in intelligent beings, and especially in the sex that pride themselves upon superior sagacity. The eternal preoccupation of man's mind with woman is centred almost entirely on the external and sensuous, and only rarely on the complex feminine psyche. Much of the discontent with married life and the lamentable antagonism of the sexes is occasioned by this ignorance.

Culture and morality are based upon a capacity to put oneself in imagination in the place of another person. The strife and the suffering in the association of the sexes arise chiefly from the reprehensible neglect of this aptitude for entering into the feelings, the natural prejudices, and the emotional erotic complexes of one of the opposite sex. Women are perhaps less deficient than men in this capacity, because the maternal instinct is accompanied by an intuition and an imagination that are often keen in understanding the bewildering moods and the enigmatic conduct of children. Thus a mother often perceives by Nature, in a flash, that which a father can only discern by reflection and psychological aptitude. Nevertheless, women in the mass, like the greater number of men, enter upon marriage with very scanty understanding of masculinity.

Education is the only valid and primary remedy for the uplifting of love and marriage to their true worth and dignity. The flagrant disabilities of conventional matrimony arise principally from the grotesque ignor-

ance of sex, the differences in the cerebral, nervous, and reproductive characters of the two sexes, and the effect of these differences upon thought and conduct. Men and women must prepare for the high state and the communion of marriage with the same intelligence and industry as they prepare for a business life. Love is not a simple recreation. It is one of the most difficult arts. The failure and the disappointment in marriage, which confront us everywhere, are plainest proof that most men and women do not understand the art of marriage.

A woman of individuality, and possessing consciousness of superior gifts, naturally resents the social submergence that marriage so often involves. Men sometimes speak of "the wife," as though the spouse was not an equal partner, or, as the Church has it, bone of one's bone and flesh of one's flesh, but a sort of appendage or material belonging, like "the brougham," or "the motor-car." Even a woman's offspring, born in torture and risk to life, and reared with infinite patience and self-sacrifice, are not really identified with her. She bears them for the man, and they continue his name and not her own. Equality in parentage is recognised in chivalrous Spain, where, when Señorita Lopez marries Señor Quevedo, the children bear the name of Quevedo y Lopez. This recognition may appear a trivial matter, but it is more important than it seems. It is a survival of a tradition that gives honour to the mother and equal dignity to parents.

Marriage should be held up as a desirable state of sex-equality and the most beautiful form of human communion. By men, too often indeed, wedlock is only regarded as a means of sexual gratification, and by women as a livelihood. Rarely, if ever, does wedlock, entered into from either of these motives, prove fortunate to one or both of the partners. The libertine, whose only chance of obtaining a chaste woman who has inflamed him is by marrying her, will tire of her charms just as readily as he has grown satiated with other women. The bride chosen thus will discover very soon that she was desired only for the evanescent bloom of physical beauty, and not for the qualities of

the soul and mind. In her recoil, she will develop coldness or sheer repulsion, and before long she will realise that she is intensely lonely; that the ardent suitor has changed into a disillusioned grumbler, who, exasperated by her indifference, gives vent to the common, bitter cynicisms about women's mercenary ideal of marriage.

These conjugal tragedies, which discourage the onlookers from marriage, are often traceable to the meretricious standards of matrimony in the minds of both sexes. A young, inexperienced girl cannot know that a wooer may be actuated simply by a vehement and transitory physical passion. She dreams that love is soul-sympathy, close and tender friendship, that will grow with the years; a community of enthusiasms and aspirations, and a glorious romance. The man who courts her, with a view to possessing her as a sexual partner, is deceived by the notion that women are much like men in their desires and their natures; and full of assurance, he anticipates happiness, or at the least, a moderate peace. Both of these unfortunate spouses are the victims of a social system that deliberately blinds men and women from the realities of life. We cannot blame them if both revile wedlock, and declare that love is a lying invention of insane poets and maudlin novelists. What is more tragic than the cry of a young heart, "I don't believe in love"?

The risks of infelicity and of sheer tragedy in marriage can be lessened by knowledge. By this means, too, many half-hearted candidates for wedlock would be encouraged to marry while young, instead of putting off the dreaded hour till advancing middle age and the uneasy contemplation of lonely, untended closing years of life, impel them to the registry office or the church, still haunted with perplexity and misgiving. Conjugality should be eagerly grasped by the young, the virile, and the hopeful, possessing a joyous optimistic belief in love, and a determination to make a splendid success of marriage. Let us rear our sons and daughters in this stimulating and rational expectation of the blessings of love-marriage and the deep joy of parentage. Let us teach them how to live and how to love; and at the fitting time they will marry, with

no scales before their eyes, no ugly, submerged sexual complexes in their minds, no uncleanness of thought, no specious, shame-faced preconceptions; but with clear, sane vision, wonder and worship, ardent emotion, educated power of self-conquest, and concern for the life that their love will call into being.

The social remedy for readjusting the tendency to defer marriage long after the attainment of the adult age, is the diffusion of healthier views of the conjugal relation, accompanied by a reconsideration of the essential question of pecuniary means. It is a sinister sign when marriage tends steadily to postponement. It is a menace to marriage itself; for it shows that men and women are growing more content with those substitutes for wedlock which, in the opinion of most moralists and the Church, induce social disaster. The dangers of the pre-conjugal sexual life have been pointed out in many passages of this book; and the general prolongation of this period is fraught with serious menace. Postponed marriage undoubtedly increases the illegitimate birth-rate, and causes the disgrace and grief of unmarried mothers.

Another reason why the late marriage of men is disadvantageous is to be found in the almost invariable masculine tendency to select a wife in the freshness of physical beauty. The young bride of the elderly husband is debarred from healthy maternity. Her children are likely to be feeble and difficult to rear. She misses the vivacity and the optimism of a companion of her own age, and is often fated to serve as nurse to a spouse afflicted with the ailments, the depressions, and the querulousness of advancing years. She is exposed to the temptations of those Don Juans who shrewdly recognise the susceptibility of the dissatisfied young wives of old men.

The broadening education of women is, to a certain extent, accountable for a decrease in marriages in the earlier years of adult life. Many women are nowadays not only the intellectual equals of men of their status or intimate circle, but they are frequently more widely cultured. Even well-educated men often think it is necessary to descend from their normal level of intellect when they are in the company of their intellectual

peers among women. This relic of the days of masculine leadership in the domain of thought induces an attitude that an increasing number of women deeply resent. It is difficult to extirpate the notion among men that nearly all women like to be treated as children, or weaklings in intelligence. The old arts of flattery, compliment, and banal witticism are lost upon those women whose interests are no longer those heretofore regarded as distinctively feminine. Many cultured women, quite capable of profound passions, refrain from marriage to-day, because their admirers are mentally insipid, or without capacity for intellectual conversation. The women of our day demand collaboration with man in the work of the world, in the arts, and the sciences. A chant of discontent pervades the utterance of those women who are conscious that their intellectual, creative potentiality is as valuable to the world as their reproductive capacity, and who recognise that a thinking woman is a better type of mother than a simpleton.

Allowing for the numerous disabilities that stand in their way, young women of the educated order are developing more rapidly and remarkably than their brothers. They are more in earnest, more ambitious, more persevering. They crave in a man a spirituality, a refinement of feeling, and an understanding, and for these virtues they seek in vain among the average young men of their acquaintance, who are often fine athletes or keen sportsmen, but puerile in character and inert in thought. Many women of birth, possessing originality of mind and intellectual yearnings, break away from the cramping, stultifying conventions and foolish codes of their caste, and seek sympathy among men and women who, though often poor and plebeian in origin, live active, mentally stimulating lives.

The fanatical respect for social caste is one of the checks upon marriage, especially among women. Young male scions of old families frequently desert the clan, and find wives from the chorus of musical comedy, or from behind the bar; and in this way the dwindling patrician stock is often perpetuated. Marrying out of the caste is more difficult and hazardous for the daughters. As a rule, the young women of gentle

birth never speak to a young man of a lower status, except across a shop counter, or when canvassing for votes. So long as the caste system is observed with fetishistic ardour, the woman of the "gentlefolk" genus, who is out of sympathy with suitors of her own class, will always find the range of selection extremely restricted. Possibly in the remote future the aristocracy of character and intellect will be the only recognised caste, and mere birth, without the prestige of virtue and wisdom, will count for nothing.

The society that is too busy to love has forfeited its right to live. It must be repeated that excessive, intemperate toil for the worship of toil, or for the mere accumulation of coin, is a sign of weakness and decadence. *Industrialism and commerce must be adjusted to life, and not permitted to kill all that constitutes living.* Spanish people are gainers because they have time to think about love, time to woo, and time to love when married. The people of the Spanish Peninsula have leisure to live to very old age; the number of centenarians is high and increasing, and the old women are remarkably energetic and healthy. Probably this conservation of vigour is partly the result of moderately early marriage. But these are people who, while capable of the severest labour under an almost tropical sun, have learned to restrict their needs in order to possess time to live and enjoy. The alleged laziness of the Spaniard is not, as is commonly imagined, a racial trait. The appreciation of the inestimable boon of leisure is the outcome of philosophy. These Southerners are superabundantly endowed with an energy that is often excessive; but they do not expend their force by turning themselves into automatic machines for the making of money. Yet for hard work I would match a Spanish labouring man with the pick of our sturdy peasants; while the working-class women are undoubtedly superior to our own in strength and physical development.

One day perchance we shall discover that a life of love is more desirable and enjoyable than a life of money-grubbing. We are so afraid of "love"—almost always associating it with something idle, or with mere philandering—that I had better explain that

by love I mean the normal expression, the fruition, and the adornment of the most potent and beautiful of all the human emotions: the basic spring of morality, benevolence, faith, charity and sympathy for our fellow-men. In marriage this passion can be sublimated to finest usage, and cultivated as a spiritual force.

Widespread compulsory celibacy is a loss of a great humanising and integrating power. This wastage results from the pseudo-celibacy of men, which often habituates bachelors to antenuptial love, and destroys the desire for matrimony and the rearing of a family. The craving for sexual variety is usually cumulative, and after long indulgence, the libertine is not capable of constancy to one woman. A man will decide not to marry until he is forty, and when he reaches that age, after numerous more or less disappointing amours and intrigues, he finds that his heart is cold to a fervent passion.

Economic prudence, inducing prolonged hesitancy and the postponement of wedlock to middle age, may bring about exactly the same disinclination. Care for money, or monoideistic preoccupation with business, has become the one thing needful in life. The state of celibacy has ceased to be irksome. Emotion is withered or absent, and vitality used up, and the man who has waited too long becomes a confirmed bachelor.

CHAPTER XVII

THE LEGAL REMEDY

MARRIAGE in England, under canonical and secular governmental control, has passed through many phases. Side by side with reputable wedlock, concubinage was at one period recognised by law, and forms of polygamous union were permitted. Catholic codes forbade marriage at certain seasons of the year, until, as a chronicler remarks, "there were but few weeks or days in the year in which people could get married at all." Consanguinity was discovered in persons who could not be reasonably supposed to bear relationship. Wedlock was held in pious disesteem at one stage, and exalted as a holy symbol in another. Marriages contracted without the orthodox ceremonial of the Church were regarded as irregular, or not actually binding. The theological wisdom practically stigmatised the conjugal relationship; yet the canonists insisted upon directing matrimony. Blackstone, in his "Commentaries," affirms plainly that the "ceremonial impediments that were invented" enriched the Church, and gave the Papacy ascendancy even over princes For a time ecclesiastic control of wedlock was much stronger than that of the civil state.

The religious ceremony of marriage dates from the sixth century of Christianity. Before this period wedded couples usually took the sacrament after the secular formalities, but there was no special marriage service. Gradually the ceremonies of a religious character became more elaborate and imposing. Matrimony to-day is celebrated in accordance with laws established by Catholic authority in the twelfth century. Protestantism introduced modifications; but the Roman

Catholic Church has never recognised secular nuptials. In 1907 there was issued an edict declaring that the celebration of wedlock in other than Catholic places of worship, or by the civil ceremony, was null and void.

In the control of the union of the sexes the Church became supreme. The state of matrimony was open to all eligible couples who mutually agreed to permanent cohabitation, and, under the canon law of the twelfth century, there was a fair measure of equality between husband and wife. Unfortunately, in the view of an ever-increasing number of men and women, when the ecclesiastic sagacity decided that the tie should be irrevocable, it fell into serious error and committed an injustice. The Church announced that matrimony was the only permissible form of sexual union, and that the persons who entered that bond could not be severed for any reason whatsoever. This claim of the indissolubility of marriage was impeached in the time of Edward VI.; but no measure of divorce came into law. Archbishop Cranmer had wider views upon matrimony than the bulk of his contemporaries. His reforms were, however, rejected, and under Mary and Elizabeth the marriage law became even stricter. Puritan Acts made marriage secular; but at the Restoration the old canonical tradition was re-established. Milton pleaded ardently for the right of divorce by consent. From his day up to the latter part of the nineteenth century, the English marriage law was more rigid than in any other Protestant country.

The anomalies and inequalities of the marriage law favour the licentiousness of the unmarried, and discourage wedlock. "A wise divorce law proves a great aid to social morality."[1] Lord Gorell, a president of the Divorce Court, declared in 1906 that our law is "full of inconsistencies, anomalies, and inequalities, amounting almost to absurdities." The present Divorce Act was described by Gladstone as "a gross injustice to women in favour of men." Lord Justice Fletcher Moulton has said that the relief granted by our Divorce Laws "is practically out of the reach of the working classes in this country by reason of expense." "We have lamentably failed to regulate marriage and divorce

[1] "Development of the State," Prof. James Quayle Dealey.

after the pattern of modern civilisation."[1] "Monogamists though we convincedly are . . . it is certainly not for us to press this to the extent which makes all mis-matings irrevocable."[2]

Edward VI. wisely recommended that "cruel usage" or "perpetual contention" alone should serve as cause of divorce; but the Church decrees that it is better for public morality that the unequally yoked and the mutually hostile shall remain bound together. It is useless to urge that judicial separation affords an adequate alleviation of this misery.

"The Church, it is true, has reimposed upon women many of the civil disabilities from which, under the Roman dispensation, they contrived to shake themselves free. . . ."[3] "Down to the nineteenth century, the solidest rights women possessed were those secured to them by ancient Roman law; and the tendency of Christian legislation was certainly to restrict rather than expand such rights."[4]

The Bishop of London, preaching in St Paul's, in 1904, asserted that "the Gospel has given woman the position she holds to-day." If instead of "the Gospel" we substitute ecclesiasticism, we shall find that this claim is open to searching criticism. English law of not very many years ago made the husband the actual lord of his wife, and he could punish her with physical chastisement. The man was the sole custodian of the children, the owner of the woman's person, and of the clothes upon her back. The wife had scarcely any status as a citizen. Even to-day she is not entitled to select her law-makers, though bound to obey the laws and pay taxes to the State.

The deliverances of eminent Fathers upon woman and her position in the community do not precisely bear out the Bishop of London's declaration. St Augustine inquired: "Why was woman created at

[1] "Divorce Problems of To-day," E. S. Haynes.

[2] "Problems of Sex," Prof. J. A. Thomson and Prof. Patrick Geddes. This book is issued under the approval of the National Council of Public Morals. The President is Bishop Boyd Carpenter, and there are seventeen bishops as vice-presidents.

[3] "Marriage and Heredity," J. F. Nisbet.

[4] "A Short History of Christianity," John M. Robertson, M.P.

all?" St Jerome remarked that "woman is the root of all evil." St Gregory said that "marriage is the outcome of sin." Such contemptuous misogamic statements abound in the writings of the early theologians. And to this day the Church, as represented chiefly by the hierarchy in Parliament, contests almost every attempt to upraise the status of women in marriage. Clerics oppose marriage with a deceased wife's sister, reform in the divorce law, and other measures tending to the welfare of women. The aim of the early canonists may have been equality between husband and wife; but mediæval and modern sacerdotal history proves that the Pauline conception of the headship of the man has characterised all the interventions of the Church in the domain of sexual morality.

The Church of Rome is consistent and logical, in so far as her creed admits no divorce from the sacramental, indissoluble union of matrimony. The Church of England refuses to accept the Catholic substitute of annulment of wedlock, and pays no heed to the views of Cranmer and other Protestant leaders, who advocated divorce as an act of justice towards husbands and wives who are irreconcilable.

"An anonymous writer in the *Law Quarterly Review* boldly asserted six years ago that there is no canon of the Church of England, either in the province of York or of Canterbury, which declares marriage indissoluble in itself. The doubts that prevailed at any rate led to Cranmer and various other Bishops allowing Lord Northampton to divorce his first wife and marry another." Nevertheless, at the Pan-Anglican Congress, a resolution was passed that "when an innocent person has, by means of a Court of Law, divorced a spouse for adultery, it is undesirable that such a contract should receive the blessing of the Church." [1]

The attitude of ecclesiastic and secular law is practically this: widespread celibacy is undesirable in the nation and society, and the only permissible alternative is licit marriage. A husband and wife may separate by mutual consent, or by judicial process; but they cannot legally marry other partners after such

[1] Compare "Divorce Problems of To-day," E. S. P. Haynes, and publications of the Divorce Law Reform Union.

severance of the nuptial contract. In the case of a husband's adultery, conjoined with desertion, a wife may obtain a divorce entitling her to right of lawful remarriage. It is doubtful, however, if the Church will fully countenance this second marriage, because clergymen often refuse to perform the ceremony. A husband may divorce his wife if she is found guilty of infidelity alone. Adultery is adjudged a more serious offence in a woman than in a man. If a discontented, quarrelsome, incompatible couple wish to break the tie, with the intent of one or both to marry again, their only course is to sin in the view of the Church and the Law. In other words, the woman must commit adultery, and the man must act with technical cruelty, and prove himself adulterous to the satisfaction of justice. But if a maladapted pair conspire together to obtain freedom by these means, and their conspiracy is discovered, the plea of one or the other will be repudiated by the court.

The church portal and the door of the registry office are always wide open to those who wish to wed. The estate of matrimony is honourable, and commended by religion and social morality. The fees paid to the priest or the government official are light, in order to encourage marriage. If one has the means of supporting a wife, the legal preliminaries to conjugality are facile. But when the door of the church or the registrar's office closes upon the legitimately united lovers, the fatal step has been taken, and from that moment there is no turning back. The fetters are upon them for life, and they are permanently linked together for weal or woe.

Is there a man or a woman free from misgiving on this perilous embarkation? Possibly, a very few have no doubt as to adaptability, compatibility, and the endurance of their affection. Many, on the other hand, who know life and their own hearts, realise the manifold risks of unhappiness in marriage, even when their affections are closely engaged. *The awfulness of the inexorable contract makes many hesitate and some refuse.* Rational vision pierces the glamour and romance, and sees the shoals and breakers. The fear may be unheroic, but it is human. All of us shrink

from the irremediable, the apparently inevitable. The "irrational knot," as indissoluble marriage has been called, is a formidable terror.

The hesitant lover puts off the fatal hour of entrance within the ring-fence of marital life. The pseudo-celibate gazes behind him at the alluring pleasures that he is about to forsake for ever, and often he resolves that, with all its disadvantages and perils, the free existence of sham celibacy is better than the fetters of wedlock. The Church condemns as deadly sin all extra-marital cohabitation; but the divorce-law is not a moral prophylactic, as daily life bears evidence.

I have referred to the instructive fact that most divorced persons in all countries marry again. This shows clearly the strength of the monogamic bias in the Western nations; and it should serve as a conclusive answer to those who affirm that facility of divorce induces lax living. As Professor Lester Ward has urged, the growing desire for more flexibility in the marriage laws is a proof that an increasing number of men and women desire that marriage shall be a real bond of soul and body. The demand for reform in marriage and divorce is, in actual truth, a demand for a higher esteem of the state of matrimony, a recognition of the real "sanctity of wedlock."

Judging by the misrepresentations of many opponents of reform in legal marriage, one might believe that the movement originated among lawless, immoral, and irresponsible persons, and is supported by libertines, the enemies of purity, and misguided extremists. On the contrary, the amelioration is advocated by earnest-minded, law-abiding, and morally zealous reformers, comprising orthodox clergymen and ministers, judges, legislators, lawyers, physicians, and men and women of all professions and grades of society. Almost all cultured women are in favour of the reform. In 1910 an inquiry among the officials of the Women's Co-operative Guild showed that eighty-two out of ninety-four expressed their approval of divorce by mutual consent, and only twelve were opposed to the reform.[1]

Two eminent Judges at least have expressed the

[1] "The Task of Social Hygiene," Chapter III, Havelock Ellis.

fullest disapprobation of the existing law of divorce within the past few years. Reiterating the opinions of such devout Christians as Cranmer, Knox, and Milton, sincere churchmen of to-day impeach the morality of of the effete enactment. In every civilised country throughout Christendom, the reaction of public sentiment against the enforced cohabitation of spouses at variance is developing in intensity.

In France the dissatisfaction is voiced by many moral reformers. Professor G. L. Duprat, in his treatise on "Morals," says: "Marriage and the conjugal life should . . . be founded on reciprocal esteem, on an equal respect on both sides for moral dignity and individual liberty, on an affectionate sentiment so profound and lasting that esteem and respect will ever form part of those sentiments which can only be experienced at the price of renewed and more and more painful effort. . . . The right of divorce is the consequence of this moral precept; in fact, as soon as love or affection, sincere esteem and goodwill disappear in conjugal relationship, why should we be compelled to lead a common life which becomes more and more unbearable."

Legouvé, in his "*Histoire Morale des Femmes*," indicates the moral hazards of the compulsory linking of the incompatible in marriage, which binds the honest, virtuous man to the woman without morals, and the virtuous and worthy woman to the brutal and vicious man.

"What causes bigamy among the people?" asks Garnier in his volume on "*Le Mariage*." "Indissoluble marriage. How is it that three men among eight have two *ménages*? Indissoluble marriage. What multiplies illegitimate children outside of the family, and the children of adultery in the family? Indissolubility. What is the result of separation? It is a disguised divorce that looses two individuals in society—condemned to immorality to satisfy their natural desires, and often that of maternity."

Jean Finot, a strong upholder of monogamic union controlled by law, says: "Divorce by the distinctly expressed wish of the couple will soon become the general law of all civilised countries. Completed by divorce secured, under certain conditions, at the

request of one of the couple, marriage will conform to the exigencies of modern humanity."

In Germany the law is somewhat more flexible than in England, inasmuch as it permits divorce for insanity and desertion, but the code remains unjust in the main. Austria, according to its own reformers, is still behind the world-movement for divorce-law reform. Russia, in 1907, granted the right of divorce to couples by consent, with the right to remarry other partners within a year. The law in Norway is framed in accord with modern needs and moral estimates of the nature of matrimony. In Sweden free divorce is regarded by many thinkers as the most effective means of lessening adultery. Ellen Key, who represents the view of cultured Sweden in the reform of the sex-relationship, says: "Whatever abuses free divorce may involve, they cannot often be worse than those which marriage has produced and still produces—marriage which is degraded to the coarsest sexual habits, the most shameless traffic, the most agonising soul-murders, the most inhuman cruelties, and the grossest infringements of liberty that any department of modern life can show. . . . The erotically noble person of the present day cannot, without the deepest sense of humiliation, belong to one he does not love, or by whom he knows he is not loved. Thus for one or both of the parties a marriage that is persisted in without the love of one or both causes profound suffering either through this humiliation or through lifelong celibacy. . . . Marriage under constraint forces people to continue their cohabitation and to bring children into the world in a revolt of the soul, which must leave its mark in their children's nature, and thus influence their future destiny. . . . Compulsion fetters legal freedom of action, but thereby only makes secret crime a social institution." [1]

In the United States the attitude to the sex question is curiously variable. Some of the social views and legal enactments are sanely conceived and equitable, while others are monstrously ridiculous and futile. On one hand, we have such inept regulations as that which prohibits a pair of lovers from decorous fondling in

[1] "Love and Marriage," Ellen Key. Chapter on Free Divorce.

the public parks; and on the other hand we find many instances of a breadth of rational opinion concerning sexual instruction for the young. There is the tyrannous Puritanism that bans scientific inquiry into the psychology of sex, and permits a post office censorship of serious books in transit; and there is the growing interest in, and the encouragement of, research in the neglected department of sex-hygiene. There are wild measures for the suppression of vice, and entirely sane official inquiry into the causes, the conditions, and the prevention of prostitution. America affords instances of excessive prudery and of frank, seemly investigation. Books are banned in the United States; but some that are suppressed in England are sold openly in America.

Divorce law in the United States, though by no means universally equal throughout all the states, is fairly humane and broad. Careless critics of marriage law reform often point to America as the country of frequent and widespread divorce. The truth is entirely contrary to this assumption. Taking the whole of the population, divorces in America are not even one per cent. It should be remembered that New England, the home of Puritanic morality, was the birthplace of reform in the matter of divorce.

Freedom of divorce is not a factor of immorality. The countries that facilitate separation of the hopelessly ill-mated are precisely those countries wherein we find the highest ideal of marriage and the deepest sense of responsibility in individual and social amatory morality. Unjust, arbitrary, ineffective marriage legislation breeds disaffection with matrimony, tends to the increase of celibacy, promotes extra-marital relations, fosters prostitution, increases illegitimate births, and makes a mockery of the sanctity of love, and often of the very institution of matrimony. Lecky insists that sex-morality develops wherever there is facility of divorce. Much of the disfavour in which legal monogamic union has fallen is due to the inequalities and the disabilities of the marriage laws. At the outset of a movement for the reform of public morals, we must readjust the legal code controlling wedlock.

Whence shall we look for this upraising of the state of matrimony? We have entrusted our most sacred

intimate acts to the charge of the priest, the accredited guide and custodian of morality. Do the bishops realise that this reform is one of the urgent questions of the hour? Are they guarding the sanctity of marriage and the sex morals of their flocks? Dr Jowett tells us that "the theologian may find peace in the thought that he is subject to the conditions of the age rather than one of its moving powers."[1] Augustus Jessopp, in "The Nineteenth Century," March, 1898, wrote: "The Anglican bishops never have started any forward movement: they have followed public opinion, not led it. The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, the Church Missionary Society, did not enter upon their magnificent careers at the suggestion of our bishops. Even in that glorious war against the accursed horrors of slavery were they the bishops who led the van?"

It is regrettable that many of our spiritual directors, holding high, and often anomalous power, are aloof from modern life and modern thought. They cannot lead, and they are unwilling to be led. Hence a kind of deadlock and a paralysis of social progress. It is the affirmed duty of the Church to promote moral well-being, and it follows, therefore, that an institution so vital as marriage should be adapted by clerical wisdom to the profound needs of humanity. If the clergy cannot or will not lead, they should refrain from secular legislation, and give scope and opportunity to those lay-reformers who understand the changing trend of public opinion in the unceasing evolution of ethics.

Mr Plowden, the well-known London magistrate, once declared that police magistrates should have the power of granting divorce. Apart from specific injustices of the law, the high cost of obtaining divorce keeps thousands of couples bound together in discord and misery. A suit *in forma pauperis* is impossible for a vast number of unhappily married but reputable and honest citizens of the United Kingdom. The unequal yoke must be borne in dull despair, or made endurable by extra-conjugal intimacies. Such marriages are a peril to society. Their influence upon the children is disastrous. This enforced cohabitation

[1] "Essay and Reviews."

makes veritable hells of numberless homes, and utterly destroys that "sacredness" in family life that religious teachers are professedly anxious to cherish.

It cannot be too often repeated that difficulty of divorce is responsible for most of the breaches of nuptial chastity. This common infidelity is not simply the outcome of concupiscence. It is an uncontrollable reaction, an aberrant resort to an abnormal outlet for thwarted feelings, not entirely sexual, which is imposed upon the despairing and the disillusioned, who are often constant by nature and strictly monogamous in instinct.

The harshness of the law actually impels persons to commit adultery and to infringe the accepted code of morality, in order to obtain freedom from an insupportable relationship enforced in the interest of "morality," and for the preservation of the "sanctity of marriage." The public knows perfectly well that the bulk of divorce suits are "arranged." Such conspiracy and deception are not favourable to respect for the dignity of the law. The whole process is made ludicrous and nugatory.

How many of us to-day could be found to assent to Dr Johnson's view of marital chastity? "A husband's infidelity is nothing," said the Doctor. "Wise married women don't trouble themselves about infidelity in their husbands." If wisdom has any connection with morality, then "wise married women" will certainly "trouble themselves about infidelity in their husbands." Parental morality demands that those who bear children shall be healthy. Racial and social ethics imply responsibility to offspring, and the wise wife cannot regard her husband's infidelities with indifference. The man's adultery may involve the infection of the woman with virulent disease, and not only the woman but her children and the family stock are exposed to grave danger. Yet the learned Samuel Johnson, who is often cited as a fine type of Christian moralist, advised wives to not only condone inconstancy in their spouses, but to regard it as "nothing." The conventional ethics of marriage afford many examples of inverted morality of this species. To man all is forgiven: for woman the slightest breach of faith is unpardonable. The way of the male transgressor is made easy by the law and public opinion.

Although the marriage laws bear more harshly and unjustly upon women than upon men, there are still certain inequalities affecting husbands. A husband is rendered responsible in law for his wife's contentions with neighbours. He can be ruined by her extravagance. A wife may wreck the home through her drunken habits. There is little or no redress for the husband who is repeatedly assaulted by a termagant wife. On the other hand, the law gives arbitrary power to the man over the woman. He can "prevent her from indiscriminate intercourse with the world," according to a regulation of 1840. The wife must live where the husband desires. If a husband chooses, he can libel and defame his wife. Absentee husbands, who leave their wives and children dependent upon the Guardians of the Poor, often go scot-free. "It often happens that the guardians find it easier and cheaper to support the wife in the workhouse than to find and prosecute the husband, who in such cases very often disappears and covers his traces. A large proportion of the able-bodied women now in the workhouse are deserted wives." Lady McLaren, whom I have quoted, suggests that we might, in these cases of desertion, adopt a method practised in some parts of the Continent, and recover maintenance for the woman from the employers out of wages due to the husband.[1]

Separation orders for cruelty and brutal assaults on wives are often farcical. "Husband and wife," says Lady McLaren, "are parted and are condemned to a life of celibacy or immorality, and the husband is very apt to disappear in order to get rid of the pecuniary burden which the magistrates have imposed upon him to keep his wife." Another inequality is instanced in the law of domicile. A husband who becomes a naturalised subject of any other country can force his wife to obey the laws of that country, civilised or uncivilised. "She loses all the rights and privileges of an English subject, including that of an Old Age Pension. Even in Germany, where the laws are very hard upon women, no wife is bound to follow her husband into a foreign domicile unless she consents" (Lady McLaren).

[1] "The Woman's Charter of Rights and Liberties."

CHAPTER XVIII

THE SWAY OF MARRIAGE

The highest form of the relationship of the sexes is conjugal love conjoined with parental affection. No metaphysical or scientific formula can explain this love. It is an eternal reality and an eternal mystery. "What is love?" asks Shelley. "Ask him who lives, what is life? Ask him who adores, what is god? . . . So soon as this want or power is dead, man becomes the living sepulchre of himself, and what yet survives is the mere lack of what he once was."

Human love is ever evolving, and its potency and influence in the shaping and development of society are not yet fully apprehended. This much the cultured Western nations have learned: that monogamic marriage is best fitted to the racial, social, and individual needs. That which continually demands knowledge is the adjustment of marriage to the mutations of society, economic, social, psychic, and ethical. No institutions can survive without adaptation to the changes that follow natural law.

Marital love is only complete and real in unions of reciprocal attraction and devotion. Mercenary, commercial, or unimpassioned marriage is a travesty of conjugal love, and its results upon the individual and the community are at best nugatory, while normally they are stultifying and injurious. The moral influence of matrimony is therefore doubtful, or entirely absent, unless genuine love consecrates the bond. Where commercial ideals are supreme, there is always the danger that marriage will become, in the words of Byron, "a matter of arithmetic." When we speak of "married love," we must be quite sure that we mean

only the marriage of free choice on the part of both persons, deep mutual respect, and a powerful, welding passion; for these are the only instances of the wedlock that promotes personal and social morality.

The prime danger of unregulated passion and irregular sexual love is in moral irresponsibility. A love intimacy between a man and woman may be said to concern only themselves so long as the union is childless; but when offspring result as a natural consequence, the love of the two partners is by no means entirely their own concern. The ordination of legal matrimony is a recognition of this fact. Responsibility in reproduction is not a mere question of parental obligation to the children; it is also a matter of duty towards society. Citizenship begins in the home. Sexual irresponsibility is immoral and destructive. We need not search far in our own social environment for evidence of the suffering inflicted through irresponsible gratification of the sex-impulse. Almost every family affords its tragic instances of erotic irresponsibility. Everywhere we meet the victims of seduction and betrayal: the deluded wife, the deceived husband, the unhappy child burdened from birth with disease, and the young man blighted on the threshold of manhood.

The moral compact between two lovers who unite in marriage safeguards both against irresponsible conduct towards one another, to their offspring, and to the community. This recognition of rights, duties, obligations, denials, and altruistic aims is recklessly disregarded by libertines; whence follow untold misery, injustice, and social degradation. Libertinism disintegrates society. Marriage integrates the social group. The security of the nation is in the triune of man, woman, and child. All the vagaries, aberrations, and anti-social actions of the amatory life must be checked by social feeling and a conflict with egoistic irresponsibility.

Responsibility in love may be imposed by law, by threats and by penalties. It is most vital and real when it arises in the conscience through an innate moral sense, expanded and deepened by cultivation. Those who know a deep love know also that love means sacrifice, restraint, and regard for others. Reflection

and knowledge develop respect for marriage, for conjugal ethics, and for racial well-being. Voluntary chastity, constancy, and purity are the outcome of the true wisdom of love, not of cowardice and fear.

"In matters of sexual morality, as in all other matters, the older moral nerve could only devise supernaturalisms. The newer moral nerve learns and teaches; it observes, and reflects, and reasons, and infers, and marvels; it restrains here, it releases there, it lifts up everywhere."[1]

Maxim Gorki tells us how, in his case, reverence for the sanctity of conjugal love kept him unspotted when living in a community of cynical ascetic monks, with degraded views of women and marriage. Brother Mikha throws contempt on love, and speaks rancorously of women. "I groaned in disgust and loathing when I heard him," writes Gorki. "I thought of my wife, of the happy tears we shed on our marriage night and the keen joy we both experienced. 'Is it not,' I asked myself, 'one of the most gracious gifts which Thou, O Lord, has vouchsafed to man?' I recalled Tatiana's kind heart, her innocence and simplicity, and I wept tears of anger at such invectives against her sex."

The counterfeit of love, its base, coarse substitute in libertinism, becomes abhorrent to one who has known the sacred communion of marriage. Not by morbid ascetic repugnances, nor by irresponsible indulgences can knowledge come to man, but through fervent reverence for love and fervent passion concentrated on one beloved person. This ideal is attainable in true conjugal mating of soul and body.

The irresponsible and flippant attitude towards marriage is a survival of the disesteem of sex-love long fostered by fanatic enmity with the decrees of Nature and externally imposed repressions of emotion and sentiment. So strong is this repression that very few Englishmen ever admit a romantic attachment to their own wives. Such love is perhaps not altogether rare, even in the restrained and reserved Anglo-Saxon race; but most Britons would rather make naught of a deep

[1] "Anatomy and Physiology in Character," Dr Furneaux Jordan.

affection than confess it to their neighbours. We have a shrinking horror of "sentimentality." Many men would sooner be called rascals than sentimentalists. This reticence is said to denote an intensity of feeling and of emotions that "lie too deep for words." I doubt whether it is so, except in a few instances. It is more likely evidence of the shamefacedness of a people who have been taught that love is somewhat silly, and that preoccupation with love-sentiment is a waste of valuable energy and time. So long as success has only one connotation in our speech, that is, the acquisition of money, or worldly position, there is but little hope of the uplifting and the refashioning of marriage.

From our childhood upwards, we grow accustomed to the contempt with which a large mass of people refer to love and marriage. Wedded life is a satirical theme for the cynic, the pessimist, and the clown. Few deride errant vices, but many mock at regulated wedlock. The state is represented as thraldom, monotony, the grave of love, a lottery in which there are far more losses than gains, a penance, and a "dusty highroad." Our view of marriage is mostly sceptical, in spite of the conventional laudation of matrimony as a moral mode of life and a symbol of holy significance. This perpetual scoffing and contumely represent married life in every unalluring guise. Rarely is the felicity of matrimony announced as a counteractive to the cynicisms.

The great multitude of the unmarried is a disintegrating force in society. Everywhere widespread celibacy restricts life, threatens social morality, and menaces public health. Bertillon, in France, has shown by statistics that crime among celibates is almost twice as frequent as among the married. Marriage has undoubtedly a reforming, sobering influence upon the conduct of both men and women. There is often moral failure in the conjugal relationship; but the sense of mutual responsibility of parents, the direction of activity, and the control of conduct in the interest of the family, tend to moral living. The solidarity of society rests upon the orderly, restrained, industrious lives of its conscientious parents. The irresponsible

amorist, living in pseudo-celibacy, neglects important services and duties to the State. The involuntary celibate is unsocial against his will.

Too little has been written of the possibilities of marriage as the highest form of friendship and communion of mind. The old view of the wife as simply the housekeeper or the mother excluded woman from intellectual equality with man. This neglect and injustice on the part of man has recoiled upon him. He usually prefers the club to the home circle, because he lacks at the fireside the mental stimulation that he craves. His wife, in the midst of an unrelieved domesticity, is not allowed to share his intellectual life, and she suffers a sense of inequality and secret indignation. The education of women, almost universally opposed by men, is changing the feminine ideal of marriage. Women of intelligence rightly demand not only physical ardour from a husband, but a share of his brain.

The reign of the Victorian prophets is nearing an end. Who among the cultured class would accept to-day Ruskin's or Carlyle's opinion on the position of woman and the true sphere of the wife? Hear Ruskin on the whole duty of an intelligent wife: "Speaking broadly, a man ought to know any language or science he learns thoroughly—while a woman ought to know the same language or science only in so far as may enable her to sympathise in her husband's pleasures, and in those of her best friend." What admirable masculine wisdom is this! The true communion of marriage is mocked by such counsels.

True comradeship in marriage is a comparatively modern development. The Egyptians, ages before Christianity, seem to have realised a close, equal companionship between husband and wife. Among the militarist Greeks and Romans, the ideal was rarely upheld, and such friendship was exceptional. The property idea of woman survived through the passionate romanticism and exalted erotic sentiment of chivalry. Especially in Teuton lands, woman was, throughout the Middle Ages, deemed the inferior of man. No equality of friendship could develop on such a basis. The marital link was usually merely sensuous. Black-

stone tells us that English law almost deprived woman of legal existence. The patriarchal view of matrimony, which has its common vestiges and everyday evidences, precludes an ideal of perfect communion in wedlock, and is the source of the intellectual subjection of women. Salvation lies in the co-direction of social conduct by man and woman, not by one sex alone.

Marriage is entering into the domain of a higher social ethic. The ideal of equal companionship will grow stronger and more general in the near future. It is for women to further this development. For too long, as the great feminist, George Meredith, said, we have deprived women of the education that not only enlightens the mind, but deepens the humane sympathies. Much of the harshness that women show towards one another is the result of their restricted knowledge of human nature. The mental equality of the sexes is absolutely essential for the upraising of marriage.

Marriage, with all its present imperfections, is a powerful moral influence, incentive, and restraint. Both the orthodox theologian and the agnostic are bound to agree that the married carry on the best interests of society and the race; and that those living in irregular sexual relations cannot effectively serve those interests. The home and the regulated family conserve the community. Each husband and each wife take up the burden of life and the service of the State. The burden may be borne joyously, or with tears and sighs; but the mass must bear it, or society crumbles into pieces. And there is no doubt whatever that, in the total sum, the balance of happiness is in conjugal love, not in purchased amours, nor in "loveless, joyless, unendeared, casual fruition."

CHAPTER XIX

THE REMEDY FOR PSEUDO-CELIBACY

In an inquiry concerning the extent of spurious celibacy it is, perhaps, easy to err in over-statement or understatement. We frequently hear the assertion "no men are chaste." There is, however, no rule without exceptions. Positive celibacy, as we have seen, is determined by several causes. It follows naturally from innate or acquired physiological or psychic disabilities; from deep religious or moral conviction; from a refined and fastidious sense; and from a fear of consequences. Religion is undoubtedly a restraining force, more especially when faith is real and vital in its ethical appeal.

Reverence for a fine ideal of love is a strong restraint. This is often instanced in the early love of manhood, which tends to spiritualise awakening passion, to surround it with tender sentiments of the soul, and to minimise the purely sensuous impulse. Unfortunately the youthful lover is usually forced, through economic or social inhibitions, to abandon hope of early marriage; and his romance, poetry, and idyllic sensibility suffer shock and injury from rough contact with life and the influence of coarser natures.

The opinion that most men are accustomed to irregular amours or to vice is fairly general in all classes. The view that "all men are naturally polygamous" is frequently expressed. Most women who profess to know the world endorse this statement; and many men do not attempt to gainsay it. We shall not wander far from the truth if we admit that a very large number of men exhibit the polygynous bias at one period or another in their lives, and that a large proportion indulge the propensity from adolescence till old age.

Besides the palpable evil results of sham-celibacy, this mode of sex-conduct engenders a gross hypocrisy. This fraudulent substitute for celibacy is a source of endless lies, deceptions, and slyness. These deceits are more flagrant in the Northern than the Southern races. Libertinism in the colder climates is usually accompanied by a cunning ostentation of respectability, prudery, and sometimes pharisaic "morality." Intellectual and moral truth languishes in this mephitic atmosphere. The loose-liver strives to hide his clandestine pleasures from the discovery of his neighbours by canting professions, prudish denunciations of those who inquire wholesomely into sex matters, and not infrequently by posing as a moralist and the enemy of vice and obscenity.

The discouragement and diminution of pseudo-celibacy cannot be the sole task of the legislator. As we have had occasion to note thoughout this investigation, legal penalties for sexual licence do not touch the root of the disorder. Here and there the law may slightly check, harass, and revenge; but the vices sneak into darker and securer corners, become more secret, tend to greater morbidity, and flourish in spite of enactments and penalties. The conventional moral fulminations may deter a few. No one who looks even superficially upon the life of our cities can take a sanguine view of the efficacy of simple moral denunciations. A reading of the Report of the Royal Commission on Venereal Diseases for 1914 is quite sufficient to arouse doubt whether we have yet discovered any effective means for partially lessening one of the greatest of the evils of civilisation.

The alpha and the omega of reform in sexual morality is moral sexual education. This education must be soundly scientific, broad, positive, nobly conceived, and reverently imparted. All archaic shams and mediæval fallacies must be weeded out of the system. There must be more, not less, decency and delicacy; and these elements can only be infused by those with minds clean-purged from shameful thoughts and morbid ideas of sex. From no other source can true, living purity arise. The way of virtue in this domain of conduct is through knowledge.

REMEDY FOR PSEUDO-CELIBACY

Strict chastity is enjoined on the young unmarried man as imperative to health and happiness. Yet on all hands he observes the infraction of this mandate by a host of pseudo-celibates. The child, filled with vague wonder, is hushed when he seeks light from his parents. He turns to the servants or to school companions for enlightenment, and finds everywhere stupid levity, nastiness, ribaldry, and vulgar ignorance. All kinds of dark, confused, distorted perceptions of sex-love grow in his mind. Sex matters may take the form of a huge secret joke, or degenerate into obsession, revulsion, or deep subconscious complexity. There is no clean rush of the fresh air of knowledge through his brain, but noisome vapours of ignorance, that may poison his intelligence and distort his moral sense for the whole of life.

Without true knowledge, and lacking a strongly inhibitive idealism, the adolescent is sent into the city to earn his livelihood. He cannot walk a few yards in the street by night, without realising that the celibacy of the moral aphorists scarcely exists among men. In the shop or office he hears constant coarse allusions, fatuous, flippant conversations, derision of ideals, sneers and shallow generalisations concerning the opposite sex, and stories of sordid adventures—all tending to contradict the scanty conventional teaching of the home and the school, to quicken morbid curiosity, and to destroy the natural cleanliness of a young mind. No beautiful concept of love, no worthy esteem of marriage, and no true estimate of woman as wife and mother are revealed to him. The only presentment of sex is the sensual in its grossest aspects. No kindly mentor tells him of the great Eros and his vast and benignant sway, how Love has shaped human life to the noblest ends, and how the race may be regenerated by this power allied to wisdom.

Hindered from marriage by impecuniosity, the young man continually exposed to the subtle excitements and stimuli to voluptuousness in a big city, finds temptation on every side. Only a high moral standard, developed through an intelligent idealistic faith, and supported by strong control, will keep the youth in that path of strict denial, which is commended by both theological and

scientific ethicists as the only path for the celibate. A single slip on that pathway may blight him physically for the whole of life. Untaught, inexperienced, and beset by insidious incitements, many young men drift into the ranks of the pseudo-celibates. Love may bring its uplifting and purifying idealism before it is too late. Often "wild-love" and vice become habitual and enslaving, and there is no hope of reformation through conjugal love. The pseudo-celibates who marry late usually return to their errant practices sooner or later.

"For the majority of men, and for at least thirty years of their lives, love is the strongest necessity, and governs them like a tyrant with no other curb than the wretched brake of written codes, which they do not read, and of social conventionalities, which they can easily silence by employing hypocrisy's mask."[1] When this natural necessity dominates in early manhood, the only permissible fulfilment in our society is to be sought in wedlock, a state of luxury beyond the attainment of a multitude of men in the full vigour of life. Quite the greater number of young men would like to marry, and a large proportion would prefer marriage before thirty. If these candidates for matrimony were assured, from the age of the awakening of the emotion of love, that wedded life would be quite possible for them at twenty-five, many would live in actual celibacy till the hour of marriage. As a rule, the passions do not become ungovernably insistent before experience, and many do not find entire continence a severe trial during adolescence and the early adult years. The sheer loneliness and lack of feminine sympathy from which older single men suffer sometimes impels them into casual liaisons. This is not so often the case with younger men.

It is not altogether extravagant to urge that a society that professes veneration for marriage, and denounces pre-conjugal sexual association, should strive to the utmost to render matrimony a social right at the proper nubile age of twenty-five for a man and twenty for a woman. Deferred marriage and the sacrifice of marriage produce, as we have seen, many of the sinister problems of society. Centuries of trial under existing

[1] Paolo Mantegazza: "The Art of Taking a Wife."

conditions have failed to ensure that regularity and hygiene of the amatory life which the thoughtful commend. "How can one satisfy this greatest of all human needs?" asks Mantegazza. He gives three replies. By buying love; by gaining it by seduction or violence; and by taking a wife. This psychologist has the belief that of all the ties that bind man to woman marriage is the least evil one. How, then, shall this contract be made practicable when the amorous ardour is at its period of greatest intensity? This is a question of questions for all who claim recognition as moral reformers, practical sociologists, and humanist guides. If we are truly in earnest when we deplore sexual vice, shudder at disease, condemn seduction, lament the postponement of marriage, and sympathise with the many thousands of women unloved by husbands and unblessed by children, we shall begin to discuss the marriage question from the pulpit, in parliament, in the Press, and on the platform. Probably the aftermath of war will make it impossible to shirk the problem any longer.

No reflective mind can find satisfaction in the spectacle of a widespread system of false celibacy. The pretence mocks at all the time-honoured moralities. We call ourselves a monogamous nation, and try to feign the belief that we are really so, knowing perfectly well that we are nothing of the kind in practice. Our promiscuity scarcely needs exposure; it is open to the eyes of any beholder who walks along the street. This promiscuous traffic is a colossal commercial affair in all civilised countries. Millions of pounds accrue from it, and are distributed widely. So well organised is the business, that a protection association, promoted in New York, with members in many cities of the United States, watches over the interests of the chief profit-reapers, and provides funds for paying legal fines. Procuration is an extensive trade throughout Christendom, and the law only succeeds in detecting a few cases. Evidence of chaotic promiscuity is also afforded by the ever-increasing output in Europe and America of medical volumes treating upon the devastating diseases resulting from it.

I am brought back inevitably to my contention that

marriage must be held up, through sound earnest education, as at least more desirable, utilitarian, and potentially happier than the life of licence, promiscuity, and intrigue. In his introduction to Reginald Kauffman's "Daughters of Ishmael," John Masefield says wisely that as the business of providing for promiscuity "is based on something deep in nature, the sexual instincts of men, it cannot be cured effectively by legislation, though much may be done and is done in this way. It can only be cured by instilling into the minds of boys a sense of personal honour, and a knowledge of the degradation which prostitution brings upon the woman. This has been done in some countries, and it may be done here." "Wherever free men without 'idealism' are living in enforced celibacy," says John Masefield, "and wherever free women without 'idealism' are living in enforced starvation," this evil exists.

The education of boys in this respect must begin with the parents. It is lamentable that women habitually seal up their eyes and close their ears to knowledge of the condition to which pseudo-celibacy, among other causes, degrades a mass of their sisters in Western civilisations. Most women tacitly accept the evil. A mother who cares for womanhood and cherishes her children should bring them up in the "idealism" so rightly valued by the poet whom I have quoted in lines above.

"Ideal," in one definition, means "conforming to a standard of perfection." This standard in sexual behaviour is seldom inculcated in a positive way. Recalling the attitude of my school companions towards "vice," I reflect that no fine ethical idealism was ever fostered in them or in me. We were told of "cardinal sins," "impurity," and "uncleanness" in association with dawning impulses; but not of the grandeur of love, the wonderful scheme of Nature in reproduction, and the marvellous mechanism of our bodies and minds. Certain desires and acts were labelled wrong. We were not taught explicitly why they were wrong. Certain impulses and restraints were represented as right; but no reason was adduced, and no practical examples shown. In our confused thought there arose the belief

that all pleasures tend to be sinful, and that all the virtues are irksome and unenjoyable. Out of this confusion springs the fatal association of normal gratification—even when regulated by religion, custom, and law—with impropriety, or mere sensuality, or as something shameful. This dreadful influence from the past ages of ignorance has caused untold and incalculable misapprehensions, morbid thoughts, immoral acts committed in recoil, and is also a fruitful source of marital misery.

Without a standard of perfection, based upon the facts of life imparted with delicate candour, no boy is effectively armed against the manifold lures that will assail him when the restraints of home are relaxed. If he has learned to respect love and marriage, and to cherish a true ideal of woman as the future companion of his soul, his helpmate in sympathy and counsel more than in material things, his equal as a human being, and not merely an object of sensuous desire, and never so without the consecration of deep, unselfish affection—then there is the probability at least that he will keep himself unspotted for the sacrament of marriage. The power of the mother in instilling this idealism is great, but how few attempt it; and how many lack the necessary culture and knowledge of life and the human heart.

Women often reproach men for the vagaries and vices of the pseudo-celibate life. Every man is the son of his mother as well as of his father. It will scarcely be assumed that all the congenital bad tendencies are derived from the male parent. Moreover, our very earliest deep impressions are formed by the mother. A few words spoken to an impressionable boy by the mother may tinge his thought and bias his conduct for good or ill throughout the whole of life. The modern scientific study of the mind proves this beyond dispute. Hence the responsibility of mothers in the training of their children in morality, and perhaps most of all in the matter of sexual conduct, is nothing less than tremendous. That is why every mother should educate herself so that she may be a proper instructor of her child, and not a blind or unwittingly harmful guide. When I meet an insensate libertine, or a morbidly

prudish ignorant woman, I have a desire to investigate his or her progenitors, and especially on the maternal side. It is not only the prenatal history and the heredity that are important. One should ascertain what sort of an environment and atmosphere the mother shaped and breathed from the first dawning of intelligence up through the impressionable years till nine; and what her influence was like when puberty brought conflicts, strange emotions, and new cravings to the expanding psyche of her son or daughter.

The remaking of marriage cannot be accomplished rapidly; but a few years of enlightened endeavour could work great and far-reaching changes. An education initiated by the mother, and continued by wise teachers in the schools, might be supplemented by State-aided lectures to adults on marital hygiene, the science of reproduction, the rearing of children, child psychology, the training of adolescents, and the conquest of contagious diseases by prophylactic means and the newer remedies.

The propaganda of marriage must be well planned and the instruction graduated. Above all, the advantages of wedlock should be insistently urged, and the evils of celibacy and counterfeit celibacy vividly illustrated. "Marriage," says Mantegazza, "is still and always will be the most honest, healthy, and ideal mode of loving." This temperate yet earnest recommendation of matrimony might be the animating spirit of the crusade against sexual anarchy and enforced celibacy. The fine ideals of love and marriage, as presented in the highest forms of art, and in the biographies of the happily wedded, should be taught as history is taught in the schools. We need a new standard, a nobler concept, of the impulse that links man to woman for the continuance of humankind, to counteract the dark superstitions of the past, the influence of the obscene and the pornographic minds, and the common flippancies and fallacies of the street. The might of love must be impressed, and the dangers of tampering with or negating this stupendous energy plainly demonstrated.

"Love," wrote Herbert Spencer, "is habitually spoken of as though it were a simple feeling, whereas it is the most compound, and therefore the most power-

ful, of all the feelings." Love is not a mere incident in human life. It is the source and the essence of life. The safe-guarding and the direction of this force is quite as imperative as the protection of one's country from external foes, yet we waste and nullify this racial force and national asset in a hundred ways. The misdirection of the instinct is the alleged cause of the decay of ancient kingdoms and the extinction of powerful nations.

History repeats itself. No zealous patriot can survey with indifference the signs of threatened decadence through social and sexual sins. There is little doubt that Western civilisations to-day bear indications of an increase of morbidities, aberrations, and perversions of the sex instinct, and that prostitution is a colossal commercial organisation among the white races. The factors counteractive to marriage become more numerous and menacing. Natural, social and industrial causes continue to complicate the anomalous condemnation of a vast mass of women to celibacy and thwarted maternity.

"Until the hearts of men are changed we can hope for no absolute annihilation of the Social Evil. Religion and education alone can correct the greatest curse which to-day rests upon mankind."[1] To whom shall we entrust the reconstruction and the revitalising of religion, and the widening, rationalisation, and spreading of the essential education? The curse of ignorance afflicts humanity. There are reactionary spirits that would shroud the mysteries and problems of life and stifle speech. It is still difficult to pierce the dense clouds of prejudice and indifference with the lamp of knowledge. The anomalies of polygyny and promiscuity, side by side with monogamous marriage, and the concomitant of compulsory celibacy, demand the attention of all citizens. Baffling as the problems appear, they are not insoluble. There are competent brains and enormous wealth in this country. If the present concern for a falling birth-rate, the postponement of marriage, the high figures of child mortality, the enforcement of celibacy, the prevalence of prostitution

[1] See "The Social Evil in Chicago," published by the Vice-Commission of Chicago, 1911.

and widespread evils resulting from the system is really deep and sincere, we can apply remedies by enlisting scientific thinkers and subsidising a great reform movement.

For the sociologist, pseudo-celibacy presents many grave social consequences. The suffering resulting from seduction and illegitimacy is enormous and beyond calculation. Illegitimate births are a source of expense to the country in the administration of affiliation orders. The evil leads to a widespread procuring of criminal abortion, often performed by incompetent persons. Deserted and disgraced unmarried mothers sometimes kill themselves or their infants. The penalties of the seduced woman are frequently terrible. Most of the offspring of illicit unions are sent to baby-farms, where they are often neglected, or half-starved, and sometimes slowly killed. The mortality of illegitimate children is more than twice as great as that of the legitimate. Many wretched girls are punished for concealment of birth.

The seduction of girls by pseudo-celibates drives many of the daughters of the working-class into prostitution. Sham celibacy is one of the proved factors of this evil. The deferment of marriage promotes the increase of casual prostitutes in all the cities of Europe, a phenomenon observed by many investigators. Disease due to this abnormal condition ravages civilisation. The statistics of prevalence are so appalling that the uninformed discredit the estimates; but physicians and experts do not, as a rule, exaggerate in this matter.

Furthermore, the lax living of a host of men deprives a multitude of women of marriage and motherhood. Such are the more manifest outcomes of the chaotic state in which we live. To these a number of indirect evils could be added.

We have ardent crusaders against vice, but where are the propagandists of one of its antidotes, marriage? What publicist of note, what cleric, what statesman has suggested a campaign for the promotion of matrimony? Love "is not merely one of the truly great things of the world, but central to it, a very mainspring of life," declare Professor J. A. Thomson and Professor Patrick Geddes, in the booklet from which I

have quoted. "It is one of the transforming forces in the individual life history, like an enthusiasm or a religion, in most of which it has played no little part; and it is a spring of conduct which has prompted much of both the heroism and the hard work of the world."

How do we preserve and direct this "very mainspring of life," and this "spring of conduct"? Do we really heed them seriously? In the desperate scramble for material possessions, this priceless treasure of mankind is neglected and tarnished. This regenerative force must be cherished for the healing of society and the future national weal.

The attitude of at least a large section of the possessing classes towards the love affairs of the mass is expressed by H. G. Wells, in his novel "The Wife of Sir Isaac Harman." The self-made man, one of the central figures of the book, has a young wife who is warmly interested in the condition of the wage-earning women. A number of girls are employed in Sir Isaac's restaurants, and he has established a club—a profitable scheme, by the way—for the benefit of his assistants. Lady Harman, who is solicitous for the happiness of the girls, suggests that young men should be occasionally admitted as visitors to the club parties. The morbid sense of decorum in her husband is quickened at the proposal. He regards it as monstrous and entirely impracticable. His veto is vulgarly expressed by allusions to "cheap bits of skirt," and the unprecedented impropriety of facilitating social intercourse between the sexes, which might lead to love matches and matrimony. This spirit of opposition to any measure calculated to promote the comfort and enjoyment of "the masses," is characteristic of many of the favoured and prosperous class. There are dour persons of both sexes who do not wish the rest of the world to love, to laugh, or enjoy. It is not by such dead souls that the promotion of wedlock for the people can be inspired.

There is a distorted and dismal philosophy of life propounded by Tolstoy in his physical decline, that the eradication of the erotic impulse would be an inestimable blessing to humanity. We must kill the love of the sexes. If man perishes from the face of the earth

in the process, what does it matter? Humanity must vanish by one means or another; why not in this way? After spending a great part of his life in writing romances, with love as the theme, Tolstoy—to whose genius as an artist I bow humbly—conceived a morbid recoil against passion. In most of the novels of his contemporaries, in the drama, in painting, and in music he discovered "expressions of lust" and base appeals to sensuality. His oblique perception did not exclude the marriage of affection from the realm of "lust." All sex-relationship, licit or illicit, refined or coarse, permanent or ephemeral, is, according to this view, almost equally obnoxious. Nature's plan is a gross mistake. Cupid is an evil spirit. Hymen is a maleficent deity. Tolstoy attacks Turgenieff for describing love affairs, and asserts that "from Boccaccio to Marcel Prévost, all the novels, poems, and verses glorify sexual love."

This violent ascetic recoil, which can be explained by psychology, came to the great Russian reformer in the illusion of an inspiration upon which he attempted to found a new morality and universal sex-purity. No doubt this doctrine has influenced some abnormal minds. In all ages men and women have arisen here and there who taught that love is an evil, and whose conviction was contagious among other unbalanced minds. To avoid all temptation, thousands have fled to the monastery, while others have mutilated their bodies. The persons who wish that there was "no such thing as sex"—most of us have met the type—might as reasonably wish that there was no such thing as life. Logical and practical asceticism would be racial death. A positively logical pessimist may rejoin "What of that?" But the normal desire is for living and for loving, though life and love are beset with trials and perils.

The Tolstoyan panacea for the evils of pseudo-celibacy is not worth examination as a practicable scheme. It is really the cry of satiety and decay. Many voluptuaries experience an almost sudden and upheaving feeling of repugnance to the pleasure or the vice that has enslaved them. Some reformed topers, and those who have lost the zest of intoxication, often become vehement denouncers of alcoholic drinks, instead of

realising that their misuse of the drinks is at fault. The weary, erotic sensualist, with a like irrationality, blames and attacks the passion of love instead of his excesses and the abuse of a natural, beneficent desire. Marriage itself is even classed among the sins by moral invalids of this stamp.

There is, however, a degree of justification for Tolstoy's plaint that romance-writers, dramatists and novelists have too frequently focused our interest upon adulterous amours, infidelities, intrigues, and the tragedies of love and marriage. "Adultery," says Tolstoy, "is not only the favourite, but almost the only theme of all the novels." This is somewhat extravagant; nevertheless, the novelist's reiteration of inconstancy in wedlock is, perhaps, disproportionate and somewhat inartistic. Undoubtedly, poets and novelists from Spenser to Byron, and from Fielding to some of our contemporaries, have tended to stress the fascination of irregular love, and to neglect or æsthetically undervalue conjugal devotion and loyalty. Almost all the novels of married life are chronicles of incompatibility, grey studies of disillusionment with love, or stories of infidelity.

The apotheosis of Don Juan, Lovelace, Lothario and Tom Jones is evidence that rakish pseudo-celibacy was, and is still, regarded as a species of heroic behaviour quite becoming to the truly virile man. As a matter of fact, the successful rake is seldom a hero of great passions and extraordinary conquests. He is often a sly, unscrupulous, morally feeble-minded man, with sex-magnetism for a certain weak type of woman, but without the attraction and the adroitness that women of finer fibre demand in a wooer. Gallantry, as it is termed, knows little of chivalry, honour, and real sympathy with women. R. L. Stevenson said that no one with a conscience could be an entirely successful Don Juan. He might have added that Don Juans are frequently of low-grade intellectuality; their alleged power of seduction being generally exerted among social inferiors, neurotic or mentally defective women, and ignorant girls.

Without any sympathy with the Puritanism that only detects a sensual lure in sincere art, we may hold the

view that the artist's preoccupation with the illicit forms of love and the inconstancy of the married has limited his vision of conjugal love, and dwarfed appreciation of the psychologic interest in happy wedlock. No true love runs quite smoothly; no wedded idyll is entirely immune from trouble. The true, intimate chronicle of an everyday married life has not been written. Here is a theme for genius; for only genius can divine and reveal the beauty, the pathos, and the wonder of the normal or the commonplace. A felicitous marriage has its comedy, its complexities, its element, too, of tragedy and grief, as well as its serenity and fealty. Matrimony, whether the pair fare well or ill, is always a great adventure, a play of deep instincts and powerful emotions, a drama of two psyches. Every marriage provides a theme for the literary artist. No lives are free from enigmas.

Art might be more often employed in the service of Hymen, in the laudation rather than the criticism and condemnation of marriage. It is well to use the novel as a popular medium for the revelation of life; and works of fiction exposing the inequalities and the defects of conventional marriage are moral sermons in disguise. But wedded love is not only a poetic dream. It exists in spite of scepticism. Love in novels usually ends at the altar. Apparently the bulk of novelists cannot conceive that our interest may be held by a recital of conjugal love.

On the whole, fiction has not presented wedlock as a more fortunate state than celibacy, or preferable to the shams of pseudo-celibacy. It is idle to declaim with Tolstoy against novels on the plea that they exalt love, and incite to amorousness. There is a better ground of complaint that novelists, for the greater part, do not encourage us to marry by furnishing examples of successful conjugality. Such incentive is not foreign to the art of fiction or the drama. It would almost seem as though many British novelists believe that love is entertaining and quite decorous in the preliminary phase of love-making and courtship, but unentertaining and indecorous when the lovers are united.

Plato's ideal of human contentment was "a measured equability of mind." Love, in the philosopher's view,

conflicted with this equability. He enjoined that we should not think about women. Parentage was necessary for the State; but love must be divorced from parentage, and children must be produced from fathers and mothers elected by the governing power. The children belong to the State, not to the parents. This communism of sex has been suggested as a solution of social amatory problems by modern followers of Plato. The system is a negation of the ideals of romantic love and free selection that have slowly grown. Plato failed to banish disordered eroticism from Grecian society. His doctrine was too severely stoic and ascetic, and the mass of men recoiled from it. The philosopher who would have men disregardful of the attraction of women, and women supine to the allurement of men, sets himself a task like staying the course of the stars in the firmament, or thwarting the tides in the ocean.

The decline of ancient Grecian civilisation was in part the effect of a neglect of marriage and of the love of the sexes as a social and centrifugal force. Hetairism and abnormal sexuality reduced the status of woman and militated against the dignity of matrimony. Plato essayed to suppress or annihilate a fundamental impulse instead of attempting to use and direct it for the benefit of both sexes and the State. The only "love" inculcated by Plato was entirely dissociated from the love of women.

The Romans also underrated to a fatal extent the utility of marriage. There was no freedom of choice for the virgin. According to law, a father could bestow his daughter upon a man at will, or take her away from her husband. It is true that Ovid discerned the potentiality of love, and possessed deep insight into women's hearts; but his nascent idealism was not shared by the mass of Romans.

Following upon the decay of the Roman race, pseudo-celibacy was indirectly fostered by the new piety as interpreted by the Fathers of the Church, who, according to orthodox historians, had "a lamentably low estimate of woman, and, consequently, of the marriage relationship." [1] The direst tyranny over the

[1] "Dictionary of Christian Antiquities."

souls and bodies of women throughout Europe reigned for centuries. During this period woman was universally regarded as the inferior of man. Even a man so wise and humane, in some broad respects, as Montaigne preferred that woman should be kept in ignorance because instruction might impair her charm.

To some extent Luther advanced the dignity of wedlock and encouraged marriage among his followers. Pseudo-celibacy was rampant in his day as a relic of the asceticism that degraded matrimony and attempted to penalise all love between the sexes. Martin Luther's clerical opponents were perhaps more bitter against his impeachment of celibacy as a state of sanctity than any other of his heresies. He was charged with immorality because he married an ex-nun and defended sex-love and matrimony.

The lingering disesteem in which women were held, except perhaps for a short period at the inception of chivalry, was inimical to equality in marriage. Women were regarded as mere objects of temptation, and wedlock was chiefly a way of escape from sinful indulgence. Chivalry scarcely raised the status of marriage, though it shed a poetic glamour and a rosy glow of romance over sex-love. The witch-burning mania under Puritanism was another grievous set-back to the position of woman in society. A widow or an old maid who had some acquaintance with the use of medicinal herbs, and employed her knowledge for the benefit of her neighbours, was exposed to a charge of magic. A slight trace of insanity was the death-warrant of thousands of lonely and helpless women.

Superstition and opposition to scientific speculation and experiment fostered a host of social evils born of gross ignorance. Sexual licence flourished, and the status of woman and of marriage in Europe was far below that of the ancient Egyptians and Babylonians. The accentuation of sex-attraction in women became almost their sole concern. Men demanded childishness, artificiality, and ignorance in women. "Our greatest charms are owing to Affectation. . . . The vacant Look of a fine lady is not to be preserved if she admits anything to take up her Thoughts but her own dear Person," writes a woman to the *Spectator* in

1712. Such was the masculine standard of womanliness. In the same journal of that date there is a letter from a woman stating that "the case of Celibacy is the great Evil of our Nation; and the Indulgence of the vicious Conduct of Men in that State, with the Ridicule to which Women are exposed, though ever so virtuous, if long unmarried, is the Root of the greatest Irregularities of this Nation. . . . It is from this one Fountain that so many beautiful, helpless young Women are sacrificed, and given up to Lewdness, Shame, Poverty, and Disease."

The upper-class pseudo-celibate of this period usually spent his youth and early manhood in dissipation, seduction, and intrigues with his neighbour's wives, and in middle-age he "settled down" in matrimony with a young girl provided with an ample dowry. Frequently he squandered his wife's money, neglected her, and returned to his adventures in town. Such examples of "holy matrimony" are still common in the Western nations.

The postponement of marriage and the excessive prolongation of courtship and betrothal favour male pseudo-celibacy. Marriage is held over, or put off, as a more or less irksome undertaking. Taine, in his "Notes on England," remarks upon the inertia of the average middle-class suitor in our society. He selects the case of an English friend of affluent circumstances, and quite able to afford marriage, who was engaged at twenty-eight. This ardent swain had been plighted for three or four years. "She is twenty-four, he loves her, he intends to marry—he will marry her; but he is sluggish, considers himself comfortable as he is; this is inertia, moral inertia. As for her, she waits patiently, she is gently submissive. He goes to see her on Saturday night," etc. Observe the cautiousness, the absence of excitement, the decorum of this nerveless, thin-blooded passion, that postpones wedlock as one postpones a luncheon-party. No wonder that we have a vast army of middle-class celibates.

CHAPTER XX

THE UPLIFTING OF MARRIAGE

It is proclaimed that marriage is the only moral, lawful, and reputable alternative to celibacy. We need not examine this rescript. In theory it is admitted by the great majority, but in practice it is very widely negated. If it were possible to compel all persons to marry, or else to lead strictly celibate lives, then would follow a remarkably rapid increase of the marriage-rate. For a millenium, the prescription of legal wedlock as the sole means of gratifying the impulse of love, or avoiding sin, has been given to humanity. To enforce this moral law, authority has visited lapses from celibate and marital chastity with opprobrium, penalty, and even tortures. Ancient Hebrews, Greeks, Romans, mediæval and modern Christian states, all shaped stringent codes for compelling ordered relations between the sexes.

Among barbarous people, the seducer of a wife is punished sometimes by death. Mosaic law penalised adultery by death. Ancient Hindus inflicted mutilations for this offence. The Spartans blinded offenders. The Saxons in Britain imposed the death sentence. The Teutons flogged adulteresses. In 1662 the New England Puritans executed both the man and the woman found guilty of infidelity in wedlock. Rigorous punishments, fines, and public shaming have been employed in all the nations of Christendom; and from time to time proposals for making unchastity a criminal offence are brought forward by legislators in modern civilised communities. Yet, according to the testimony of reformers in all the advanced nations, sexual vice, infidelity, and unchastity are universal, and said to be increasing.

Drastic laws, severe reprisals, ostracism, and even capital punishment have failed to enforce chastity among the unmarried and the married in all parts of the globe. In all ages law-makers, ecclesiastic and secular, have resorted to austerity and force for the preservation of virtuous amatory conduct. Scarcely ever in human history has the priest or ethical philosopher attempted to convince mankind, by reason and example, that regulated matrimony may be more advantageous, tranquil, enjoyable, or at least quite as satisfactory as irregular relations, hired love, adulterous intrigue, and ephemeral promiscuous union. *Thou shalt not* has been proclaimed from a million pulpits, and emphasised with threats of punishment in this life and eternal pains beyond the grave. In the code of the sexual life, more than in any other moral code, the attractiveness of virtue has been neglected as a phophylaxis of vice.

No high and alluring ideal of wedlock was held up by those early teachers who accepted the Pauline appraisement of marriage as a means of avoiding sin and suppressing wayward desire. This conception tinged all the counsels for centuries, and its influence is palpable to this day. The Church, at one period at least, denounced alike illicit intercourse and wedlock. There was no possibility of purity except in absolute abstinence. The evils accruing from this doctrine are flagrant throughout history. Our widespread, meagre evaluation of marriage is one of the results. The symbol of the union of Christ with His Bride, the Church, was devised to render matrimony a permissible state of holy living. Unfortunately the faithful have not always revered this symbolic sacrament; otherwise the supreme dignity of the marital state would be more esteemed.

The historic crusade with impurity has failed, because purity, in its true sense, has not been defined and incessantly promulgated as the happier mode of living. A child is wont to question why he should obey the counsels of his parents; and the wise parent will endeavour to convince the child that obedience of the moral rule brings satisfaction, whereas infringement brings penalties and unhappiness. Every intelligent mind asks the question, " Why should I act in this

way, and refrain from acting in that way?" Positive ethical teaching essays to provide a convincing answer to such rational inquiry. Moralists should endeavour, therefore, to convince that the path of purity, or the state of marriage, though not immune from difficulties and trials, is less perilous and more tolerable in the long run than the path of impurity, or the state of libertinism, and that virtue is not always painfully laborious. This might be proved on utilitarian grounds. There is evidence enough that, as most persons marry, and that many marry more than once, the majority find at least a fairly high degree of felicity in wedded life. I have shown that the married live longer than the celibate; that they preserve higher health of body and mind, and are less subject to neuroses and psychoses; and that conjugality develops restraints and virtues that tend to the well-being of society.

All counsels of sex-morality must be savoured with practical reason, and made positive and explicit. It is futile to offer marriage as an alternative to a supportable single life, or as a substitute for pseudo-celibacy, unless marriage is represented as more alluring than these conditions. Wedlock should be regarded as a truly great and noble social sacrament, and not as a way of escape from sin, a life of material comfort, or a mere custom of respectability. Esteem for marriage must be inculcated in order to counteract disesteem and reluctance to marry. The potential worth of marriage is only recognised by those who think clearly and deeply upon the subject. Yet the mass of men and women who enter lightly into this momentous partnership are profoundly ignorant concerning its character and the innermost feelings of one another. This may seem extravagant to all except those who have devoted close inquiry and observation. There are still millions of people who think that instinct, or the play of sex-attraction, is the beginning and the end and the totality of love and marriage, and that if we "follow our instincts" we cannot go far wrong in the realm of Eros. No greater fallacy exists. Is there a sane man who relies upon his "instincts" in business affairs?

Love is a tenfold more complicated feeling than

hunger. Nevertheless, to appease his hunger, a man in a civilised community must undergo preliminary education and training in a craft or profession, and equip himself mentally and technically for the pursuit of food. As a candidate for labour or business, he is bound to fit himself for a keen fight, and for this he employs serious reflection. Yet as a candidate for love, the duties of a husband, and the production and rearing of offspring, he neglects all study and preparation. Men often fail in business because they have not made business a science. Men and women fail every day in marriage because they have never attempted to learn the art of marriage.

The average man and the average woman of marriageable age are quite incapable, through ignorance, of estimating the importance of love and marriage in the scheme of life. If ignorance brought bliss in this case, it might be prudent to avoid knowledge; but the fruits of ignorance are so profoundly disastrous in love, conjugality, and parentage that ignorance can only be described as immoral.

Instinct, which directs the inferior animals in love, fails man when he is most in need of it. We fall in love instinctively; but we cannot instinctively alone make a success of marriage and the passing on of the flame of life to our children. These are matters of grave reflection. Instinct arouses erotic emotion in a man; but it does not teach him that which all men should know, that the woman he loves is a being differing not only in outward conformation from himself, but framed and shaped differently in brain and nerve, and in infinite subtle and elusive forms. Instinct does not inform a lover that the beloved is a female soul as well as a female body.

Nor does instinct, like a magic inspiration, convey to a woman all that she needs to know of the male soul, its profound desires, its complexities, and its specific differentiations. Men are not taught to understand women, and women are not taught to understand men. Without even the most rudimentary knowledge of comparative sexual physiology and psychology, how can the sexes hope to understand each other, and to live harmoniously, morally, and sanely in wedlock?

Many men know more of the psychology of the horse than of woman. A woman who drives a motor-car has at least some knowledge of its mechanism; but many women who take husbands for life know nothing whatever of masculine organisation.

The promotion of marriage in early adult life, as a part of social hygiene, must begin with a new canonisation of marriage. This is the task equally of the fervent poet and the scientific thinker, whose respective labours for humanity are never at variance in essentials. Angelo Mosso, one of the leading physiologists of our time, expresses this accord of art and science in the following words: "We console ourselves with the reflection that poetry, enthusiasm, inspiration and passion rise again under new and stronger forms in the contemplation of reality, that in the search for truth there lies a fascination which beautifies and ennobles the human intelligence, and that sentiment is never extinguished by any advance of science." The sentiment for marriage can be deepened by a rational understanding of the passion that attracts and unites the sexes. We need an apotheosis of conjugal love as a basis of the new appreciation of marriage. Reverence for love should be fostered from the outset of the adolescent period by parents and pedagogues. The spiritual import and the beauty of the love of sexes should be revealed, and a sense of worship instilled in young minds. The wonders of reproduction in the vegetable and animal kingdoms must be taught by trained and sympathetic teachers. Sexual pedagogics now form an important part in the educational course of some schools in England and America, in Switzerland and other continental countries. I have quoted the opinion of eminent medical men upon this reform. It may be well to cite a few examples of how this branch of knowledge is taught in this country and abroad.

At the International Congress of School Hygiene, in 1907, two masters gave evidence of the methods in their respective schools. Mr Sidney Unwin, of the well-known Bedales School, said that parents were requested to speak to their children on sex-questions. "Some do; many don't." The method at Bedales is the encouragement of the rearing of insects and the study

of animals and plants. Botany and zoology are taught. "Sexual indulgence," states Mr Unwin, "is intimately connected with the affections, and the affections must be trained as much as every other part of the child's personality, if he is to learn control and a right use of the sex-forces within him."

Mr G. W. S. Howson, Gresham's School, Norfolk, said that "No definite time can be fixed for plain speaking, but that the schoolmaster should be vigilant to choose the psychological moment to speak, for speak he must, as so many parents fail to do so."

Dr Edouard Ceresole, Lausanne, Switzerland, testified that "sexual hygiene and ethics are an object of paramount importance during the school age, which is, at the same time, the age of sexual formation of the human being." Dr Ceresole said truthfully that "the ideas of the day on sexual hygiene and ethics are still those of the barbaric ages. They are not in harmony with the progress of modern science, and they constitute a permanent and immense danger to society." These subjects should be taught in the higher classes. Dr Ceresole concluded with the statement: "To people who taboo all sexual subjects as being immoral, I will answer that a scientific fact or truth is never immoral, but that the hypocrisy and concealment now prevailing with regard to such matters are decidedly so."

Dr Stanislav Razicka, of Prague University, related that he had given lectures on sexual hygiene, step by step, up to the age of fourteen. In one town the headmasters of all the secondary schools encouraged their pupils to attend the lectures.[1]

In America the teaching of the reproductive process and of sexual conduct is being systematised in some of the states. Havelock Ellis ("The Task of Social Hygiene") refers to a paper read by Dr W. O. Henry to the Nebraska Medical Association in May, 1911, in which it was proposed to graduate the instruction from the age of eight years in separate classes for boys and girls. The course begins with the reproductive life of plants. In Ontario a special Government teacher visits all the State schools, and gives special instruction in

[1] See "Transactions of the International Congress on School Hygiene," 1907.

sex subjects. The success of this reform has led to the appointment of more teachers of both sexes.[1]

It is satisfactory to note the growing strength and extent of the movement for diminishing the widespread ignorance of sexual psychology. Many, if not most of us, can call to mind the bewilderment and doubts of childhood and adolescence naturally aroused, but often abnormally and unwholesomely "explained" by the foolish or the vulgar-minded. Let us trust that the time is near at hand when the mentors of youth in this mystery of the foundation of life will be chosen by society from fully equipped, sympathetic, tactful instructors. It is strange, indeed, that we have waited so long for this initial step in a great moral and hygienic reform.

A distinguished English teacher, Miss Hoskyns-Abrahall, advocates instruction in physiology and hygiene, and states that both boys and girls by the age of twelve should possess a general knowledge of the functions of the body. "Early adolescence is the time when boys and girls should begin to realise the responsibility of one generation to the next; should learn to feel that they are to hand on a great inheritance, and should be animated by the generous resolve not to suffer this to be impaired. Such thoughts as those should be deeply impressed before the time when personal feelings naturally arise."[2]

The time of betrothal is perhaps the appropriate opportunity for important supplementary education. Conjugality should be taught, as the late Sir James Paget wisely recommended. A young man, at the age when love may at any hour arouse the deepest emotions, should not be ignorant of the distinctive psychic and nervous traits of woman. It is neither just nor reasonable that a bride should be entrusted to the care of an ignorant husband, who, according to canonical law, is the head and the supreme custodian of the spouse.

The uplifting and the consecration of marriage cannot be achieved without the earnest inculcation of a deep respect for this most profoundly important

[1] Havelock Ellis op. cit.

[2] "Child Nature and Education" (pamphlet), Sherratt & Hughes, Publishers.

human relationship. Upon a basic reverence, we may hope to instil that psychological knowledge of sex which is the chief safeguard of love in wedlock. When we recognise the powerful affectability of woman, our preconceptions of the feminine character, mostly derived from idle or cynical generalisations, undergo great permutation. The irrationality and the hypersensitivity of women, which afford an eternal theme for poets and novelists, are merely shoots of the same stem that produces the most lovely efflorescence of devotion, self-sacrifice, tenderness, and sympathetic charm. There are profound physiological causes for the psychic complexities of both sexes. In woman these temperamental enigmas are often associated with perversities of the moral sense, or an innate lack of control, giving rise to such apothegms as "woman is a spoilt child," "it is useless to argue with women," "women are 'uncertain, coy, and hard to please,'" "women are difficult," "women are guided entirely by the emotions," "women do not reason," "women are untruthful," "women are cunning," and many others.

A young man hears these judgments uttered almost every day, until he accepts them as evidence that women are the moral and intellectual inferiors of men, charming enough to the æsthetic sense, and alluring to the physical nature, but quite incomprehensible, provoking, and unreasonable. One man tells him that "the country will be ruined if women gain political power"; another declares that "all women are unreliable," etc. Sex-antagonism is accentuated in this way, and men go to the altar with the secret misgiving that they are about to cherish a being who is a weird compound of one-part angelic and three-parts a naughty child.

As man is constituted the legal and social "head" of the woman, all leadership in the intricate game of marriage is vested in him. Naturally, he takes the more active part in courtship and initiation in conjugal relations. The success or the failure of matrimony is, therefore, very largely in the hands of the husband, if not entirely dependent upon him. In most cases, as common experience proves, the leading partner in this

supremely intimate union takes no serious pains to understand his colleague's psychology and anatomy, nor to instruct himself in his duties as a husband and a father. Nine times out of ten he is quite ignorant of the fact that a single shock, producing fear, may transform his partner's character for the rest of her life. He sets out with the assumption that because his wife is a human being she is of necessity like himself in physique, soul, and mind, and only different in the primary sexual characters. A few months of conjugal life will disperse his preconceptions, and he will be more bewildered than ever by the problem of "the eternal feminine." Many marriages are wrecked in the honeymoon.

The needs of the two sexes in marital life are not entirely identical. Man retains a primitive aggressiveness, which is often a little brutal, and rarely refined to tactfulness and patience. Woman retains a natural timidity, which the artifices of society have intensified for ages, and in her emotional and erotic desires she evinces marked differentiation from the more forthright and plainly manifest masculine desires. When man, as the wooer and active partner in love, fails to recognise this, both husband and wife are exposed to the gravest risks of unhappiness, if not to sheer antagonism.

It may be said, in criticism of my contention, that science cannot banish all risk of unfortunate wedlock. This is true; there is no infallible method whereby human misfortunes and errors may be entirely avoided. There is, however, security in knowledge, while extreme danger lies in a lack of knowledge. Very slowly, Christian men learned that the death of a cow, or the blighting of a crop, had no connection with the malignant glance of a witch; but until men learned this, thousands of unfortunate, aged women were tortured and burned. Many women suffering from hysteria, or a minor form of mental disease, were condemned by ignorant neighbours to the ducking-stool, or forced to wear the scold's bridle. Physiology, which is always on the side of humanity and the lessening of suffering, and the newer science of psychology, have taught us that irritable nerves, and not Satan,

cause nagging and ill-temper; and instead of attempting "to beat the devil out" of neurasthenics, we endeavour to restore balance of mind and soundness of nerve.

The hygiene of marriage is more neglected than any other department of the science of health. Our knowledge even of the reproductive process was very scanty until a late period in the history of physiology, and much remains for discovery. There are functions and manifestations that still baffle investigation. We are gradually accumulating knowledge concerning the brain, the spinal cord, and the nerves; but the whole mechanism of thought remains a mystery, and conduct, the outcome of thought, is as yet only dimly comprehensible, even with the aid of psychology, while without it human behaviour cannot be appraised in any sense. Philosophers, statesmen, and leaders of men who have exhibited an understanding of human nature, have been those who possessed the highest degree of psychological insight. They may not have been students of science; but the cast of their minds was scientific, reflective, closely observant, curious, and reasoning.

The psychology of sex is an imperative study as a preliminary to the discussion of the hygiene of marriage, heredity, race-culture, and sexual ethics. Research in the vague realm of the subconscious is revealing great truths, especially in the domain of amatory emotion and conduct. The study of the normal mind is undergoing revolution that forecasts a far deeper understanding of humanity than has entered into the dreams of sages and metaphysicians. Morbid psychology is teaching many facts of the highest therapeutic value, shown by practical results in the cure of obstinate obsessions, delusions, and phobias. But of the psychology of the normal life, particularly in regard to the massive passion of love, there is a region as yet scarcely suspected by many educated persons.

The mothers are of greater importance to a nation than its philosophers and politicians. Sound parentage should be the first means of promoting national morality and well-being; and when marriage is raised to its true value, the reckless and immoral reproduction

of criminals and lunatics will be diminished by the prudent personal selection in love of the fit and the responsible. There is urgent need for a more zealous care of maternity. Earnest educational and social reformers in many countries advocate the training of young women in the preservation of health and the duties of motherhood, and this education should be greatly extended and aided by governmental subsidies and the employment of well-equipped teachers. Wherever schools for mothers have been established, the results in the improved health of the mothers and children, and the diminution of child mortality, are very marked and encouraging.

The wastage of mothers and of children through ignorance of physiology, health laws, and proper dieting is appalling. An increase of marriages *per se* will not counteract this evil; there must be a training for parentage.

The question of the increase of the feeble-minded demands State inquiry and public effort towards providing a remedy. This is a matter of national hygiene. Our knowledge of the problem is based almost entirely on the cases of defectives among the poor, as noted in the children of the elementary schools; but the children of the rich are frequently born feeble-minded, with insane or criminal tendencies, and stigmata of degeneration. Poverty and alcoholism account for many cases among the working-class, poverty ranking much higher than intemperance. The characteristics of defective children in Copenhagen, recorded by Dr Paul Hertz, Lecturer in School Hygiene, are chiefly tubercular affections, chorea, spinal disease, adenoids, enlarged tonsils, eye trouble, and ear diseases. "Physical weakness and morbidity" are due to poverty and insanitary houses.

Tuberculous disease is responsible for about 50 per cent of defectives weeded out from the London elementary schools, and deformities and paralysis account for 30 per cent.

Dr F. May Dickinson Berry, Assistant Medical Officer to the London City Council, stated at the International Congress on School Hygiene, 1907, that poverty, dirt, slovenliness, and overcrowding produce

feeble-mindedness. The mothers of defectives are of "low-grade intellectuality," and some of the fathers are illiterate. Under-nutrition and overstrain of the mothers during pregnancy are causes of feeble-mindedness in offspring. "Scarcely any of the mothers had any idea how to care for the children," states Dr Berry. Some of the mothers stole food provided for the ailing infants. The Medical Officer suggested that ill-paid work and starvation wages influenced mental degeneracy. Mrs Mary Dendy (Manchester Education Committee) said that drunkenness was not a cause but a result, and that "defectives are in as great number amongst the very rich as amongst the poor." Dr Shuttleworth agreed that the well-to-do frequently produce defective children.

Dr Robert R. Rentoul points out that we permit lunatics, dipsomaniacs, kleptomaniacs, and the physically diseased to marry, *while marriage is debarred to many healthy persons.* In the hundred and fifty schools for mentally defective children there were, in 1907, six thousand children. Dr Rentoul says that these children will marry and produce offspring. "How can the products of such unions be either healthy or happy?" In the view of Dr Rentoul men should marry at twenty-five and women at twenty-one. Employers should not be allowed to refuse work to married men. The diseased should be restrained from marriage by law. Every person should, upon applying for licence to marry, produce a certificate of health. Bachelors between the age of twenty-five and fifty-five should be taxed. The income-tax for married men should be lessened. Idiots, lunatics, dipsomaniacs, sexual perverts, and victims of the drug habit should be forcibly sterilised by "simple operations," as practised in Indiana, and proposed in California and Pennsylvania. "The mental degenerates in the United Kingdom are costing the British tax-payers at least fifty million pounds every twelve months," says Dr Rentoul.

These measures are drastic, and some points are open to serious consideration; nevertheless, as Dr Stanley B. Atkinson stated at the Congress, commenting upon Dr Rentoul's thesis, the "surgical scheme would peremptorily rid the race" of the terrible evil of breeding

from the unfittest, though "it might, however, introduce consequential social anomalies and perils."[1]

The mistakes, the neglects, the unintelligence leading to the wreckage of marital peace and stability, the momentous prenatal injury to offspring, and lack of proper care in infancy, childhood, and adolescence should convince us that we are in need of the light of physiology and psychology to illumine marriage and to reveal its dangers. And not only to lighten the obscurity is the lamp of science requisite.

The more we learn of the wonders of love and life and the soul of man, the more we discover the exquisite meaning of marriage, and realise its truly sacramental nature. From rude, primitive sexual pairing there has grown a supremely entrancing and tender idyllism that is the most potent of all spiritualities and a strange miracle of daily life. The true votary and venerator of marriage is the man or the woman who strives through knowledge to elevate marriage, and to make that state holy and exemplary.

A new earth may, in the future, be shaped by the passionate and reverent faith of husband and wife. Stars are born and fade into darkness, races of men pass away, nations fulfil their evolution and perish, kingdoms decay, and creeds dissolve; but Love is still young in cosmic history, and its power among men for virtue, joy, and the serene endurance of the sorrows of life, and the ennobling of coming generations, is but dimly apprehended by the mass of mankind.

[1] These testimonies and others will be found in the highly instructive volume of "Transactions of the Second International Congress on School Hygiene," 1907.

A lady who read these pages in manuscript remarked to me that it was useless to advise parents and teachers to study this subject unless I referred my readers to authoritative instructive volumes. I have therefore set down a few works, mostly of an introductory character. *General Physiology*: "The Human Body," Dr A. Keith (Home University Library); "The Human Mechanism," Hough & Sedgwick; "The Principles of Physiology," Prof. McKendrick. *Psychology of Childhood and Adolescence*: "The Century of the Child," Helen Key; "Studies of Childhood," Prof. J. Sully; "Adolescence" (2 vols.) Principal Stanley Hall; "Youth" (same author); "First Three Years of Childhood," B. Perez. *Health of Children*: "Health in the Nursery," H. Ashby. "Counsel to a Mother," P. H. Chevasse. *Psychology*: "The Brain," Dr H. C. Bastian; "Psychology," Prof. W. McDougall; "Primer of Physiological-Psychology," McDougall. *Sexual Physiology and Psychology*: "Sex," Prof. J. A. Thomson and Prof. Patrick Geddes, also "Problems of Sex," and "The Evolution of Sex" by the same writers; "Sex in Relation to Society," Havelock Ellis; "Man and Woman," Havelock Ellis. *Hygiene of Marriage*: "Woman, Marriage and Motherhood," Elizabeth S. Chesser; "Marriage and Disease," H. Senator and S. Kaminer; "Healthy Marriage," G. T. Wrench; "Before I Marry," T. S. Clouston; "Painless Childbirth," H. Rion; "Conversations with Women Regarding Health," A. Rabagliati; "The Prospective Mother," J. M. Slemous. *Various*: "Love's Coming of Age," Edward Carpenter; "The Task of Social Hygiene," Havelock Ellis; "Evolution of Marriage," Letourneau; "The Art of Taking a Wife," Mantegazza; "The Nature of Woman," J. L. Tayler; "The Problem of Race Regeneration," Havelock Ellis; "Womanhood and Race-Regeneration," Dr Mary Scharlieb; "Education and Race Regeneration," Sir J. E. Gorst; "The Declining Birth-Rate," A. Newsholme; "Four Epochs of a Woman's Life," Dr A. M. Galbraith; "Natural Inheritance," Sir Francis Galton; "Sexual Ethics," Prof. Michels; "Mother's Year-Book," M. F. Washburne; "Parenthood and Race Culture," C. W. Saleeby; "Sex Antagonism," W. Heape; "How to Love," Walter M. Gallichan; "Mental Deficiency," A. F. Tredgold; and "Psychology of Woman," Laura Marholm.

INDEX

ABNORMALITIES, 12, 35
Abrahall, Hoskyns-, 214
Adultery, 177, 183, 208
Alcoholic excess, 34, 53, 81-82
Allen, Grant, 137
Anæmia, 20, 34, 86
Anæsthesia, 34, 83, 86
Anstie, Dr, 111, 126
Anthony, St, 74
Aristotle, 116
Asceticism, 16
Augustine, St, 74, 175

BACHELORS, taxation of, 27, 133, 138-139
Balls-Headley, Dr, 118, 120
Barlow, Sir T., 156
Barr, Sir J., 94
Berthelot, 55
Bertillon, 124
Births, male, 50
Birth-rate, 40, 41, 42-43, 46, 199
Blackstone, 173, 190
Boismont, B. de, 122
Booth, Charles, 31, 42
Brill, 52, 110, 111, 125
Buckle, 45, 100

CAMPBELL, Dr H., 50, 119
Celibacy, 15; areas of, 46. 49; in Burma, 23; compulsory, 23, 24, 27, 63. 172; false, 63, 69, 72, 191, 195; in India, 23; among Jews, 27; in Rome, 27; in slavery, 24; in Sparta, 27
Ceresole, D., 213
Chastity, 12, 21, 71, 84, 114, 115, 193, 209, primitive, 22, 92; Strindberg on, 28; teaching of, 14, 91
Child mortality, 33, 199
Clement, St, 78
Clerks, 69, 161
Clouston, Dr, 111, 117
Cobbett, W., 62-63
Concubinage, 134, 173
Co-operation, 144
Cost of living, 66-67
Courtship, in animals, 17
Cranmer, 179
Criminals, 95-96, 188, 218

DEALEY, Prof., 174
Dejerine, Prof., 111, 119, 121
Divorce Law, 104, 174 *et seq.*; reform of, 178-184
Drysdale, Dr C. V., 42
Dubois, Dr P., 125
Duchâtelet, Dr, 89
Duncan, Matthews, 44, 118
Duprat, Prof., 179

EDUCATION, moral, 87, 96, 103, 106, 109-110, 112, 114, 155, 156, 166, 168, 192, 196, 209-210
Ellis, Havelock, 15, 40, 43, 50, 85, 90, 92, 111, 118, 134, 213
Erasmus, 74, 77
Eugenics, 107-109

FARMING, improvement of, 144-146

INDEX

Feeble-minded, increase of, 218
Féré, Prof., 111
Finot, J., 55, 179
Flirting, 113
Food, economy in, 59
Forel, Prof., 111
Fournier, 111
Fox, Dr C., 125
Frazer, Prof., 92
Free Love, 135-138, 165
Freud, 52, 117, 125
Frigidity, 17-18, 85

GALTON, Sir F., 108
Garnier, Dr., 47, 70, 75, 111, 112, 179
Geddes, Prof., 127, 148, 200
Gilman, C. P., 56, 58, 61
Godwin, W., 135
Gowers, Dr, 111
Greg, W. R., 62
Gregory, St, 176

HALL, Prof. Stanley, 110
Havelburg, Dr, 119
Haynes, E. S. P., 176
High pressure of life, 53
Hippocrates, 116
Horsley, Sir Victor, 151, 156
Housing problem, 59-60, 147-151
Husbands, 184; conjugal responsibility, 215-216; responsibility in law, 184
Hyperæsthesia, 16, 34
Hysteria, 87, 110, 114, 116, 117, 216

ILLEGITIMACY, 67, 200
Industrialism, 26, 31 *et seq.*, 141 *et seq.*, 171
Infant mortality, 20, 43, 46, 50
Infecundity, 41

JACOBI, Dr A., 35
Jerome, St, 74, 176
Johnson, Dr, 153, 183
Jones, Dr E., 125
Jordan, Dr Furneaux, 187
Jowett, Dr, 182

KEY, Ellen, 147, 180

LAMBKIN, Lt.-Col. A., 93
Lecky, 100, 181
Legouvé, 179
Living-in, 67, 151
Lombroso, 90, 111
Longevity, 123
Love, Herbert Spencer on, 198; in India, 23; nature of, 128; novelists on, 203; in Spain, 171; value of, 154, 155, 161, 171, 185, 191, 198, 200, 220
Luther, 15, 206

MACLAREN, Lady, 46, 184
Mantegazza, 44, 111, 161, 194, 198
Marriage, 9; art of, 167, 211; in Belgium, 48; Church and, 10, 76, 100, 102, 109, 173, 175, 176, 209; Egyptian, 189; encouragement of, 27, 146, 155, 167, 169, 194, 198, 200, 210; in France, 47; Grecian, 13, 205; in Holland, 48; hygiene of, 43, 122, 126, 217; improvident, 162; Jews, 99, 105; postponement of, 10, 44, 47, 115, 118, 194, 207; in professions, 41, 70; in Rome, 13; and shop assistants, 35; in Spain, 48; in Switzerland, 48; unpopularity of, 13, 153; and working classes, 29 *et seq.*
Marro, 44, 111
Masefield, John, 196
Maudsley, Prof., 111, 116
McGillicuddy, 117
Men, mortality of, 51; ignorance of women, 166
Meredith, 190
Metchnikoff, Prof., 108
Michels, Prof., 110
Mill, J. S., 142
Milton, 75, 174
Misogamy, 87, 166
Monasticism, 122, 202
Monogamy, 88, 129
Morris, William, 15

INDEX

Mosso, Prof. A., 212
Mothers, education of, 217-218
Mott, Dr, 119

NEANDER, 74
Neurasthenia, 79, 84, 87, 114, 117, 125, 162
Neuters, 19, 72
Noyes, J. H., 136

OWEN, Robert, 136

PAGET, Sir J., 111, 156, 214
Parentage, 155, 167, 168 183, 186, 205, 217
Paul, St, 99
Pearson, Prof., 108
Plato, 116
Plowden, Mr, 182
Polyandry, 135
Polygamy, 88, 133, 134
Pouillet, 111
Promiscuity, 129, 195
Prostitution, 23, 34, 67, 72, 89, 101, 102, 103, 151, 195, 196, 199
Psychology, value of, 117, 211, 214, 216, 217

RENTOUL, Dr R., 219
Rents, 59, 60, 148, 149
Rogers, Thorold, 26, 36
Rowntree, B. S., 31, 69
Russia, precautions against depopulation, 165

SANGER, Dr, 89
Schreiner, Olive, 56, 59
Separation orders, 184
Sex, ignorance of, 98, 211; phobia, 76, 78, 79, 87; question in United States, 180-181; sublimation of, 79
Sexual anæsthesia, 16; immorality, 192; morality, 187
Shelley, 135
Sherard, R. H., 36, 38
Simplification of life, 61, 157, 161
Slavery, 24-25
Slums, 150
Sterilisation of unfit, 219-220
Stevenson, R. L., 203
Strahan, 44
Suicide, 122

TEACHERS, 72-73; and sexual instruction, 212-214
Thompson, Prof., 108, 127, 200
Thoreau, 157
Tilt, Dr, 78
Tolstoy, 201-203, 204
Tourette, G. de la, 111
Town life, 66-67

VENEREAL DISEASE, 93-94, 156, 192, 200
Vinci, da, 121

WAGE-EARNERS, 33, 141-143 160
War, 64, 146, 164
Ward, Prof., 178
Wells, H. G., 201
Westermarck, 92
Women, advance in culture of, 170, 189; affectability of, 215; Church and, 205; domesticity of, 162-163; in eighteenth century, 206-207; parasites, 56-58; resistance to disease of, 50; Ruskin on, 189; workers, 19, 36-39
Work fever, 54, 154, 158

YOUTH, dangers of, 193-194, 197

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN
BY THE NORTHUMBERLAND PRESS, THORNTON STREET, NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE

NEDWICK'S BOOK STORE
171 NO. MICHIGAN AVE.
CHICAGO 1, ILL.
"OUT-OF-PRINT-BOOKS"

HQ 800 G168g 1915

02710020R

NLM 05018110 4

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE